

California Establishes A New State Educational Agency 1970s

Richard K. Mastain

Editor's Introduction:

In Article 1 of the Statutes, the preamble to the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 calls for “broad minimum standards for teacher preparation and licensing to encourage both high standards and diversity . . .”

The Legislature finds that highly complex detailed, and prescriptive regulations governing the preparation and licensing of teachers and administrators frustrate imagination, innovation, and responsiveness. In addition, the Legislature finds the diversity of functions served by modern education require licensing regulations which are flexible, realistic, responsive, and simple.

The first meeting of the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL) was held in the Department of Education building March 17–18, 1971. In attendance, and introduced by the Governor’s Education Advisor, Dr. Alex Sheriffs, were all of the Governor’s appointees and three of the ex–officio members. The representative of the UC system was unable to attend, and the representative of the State Superintendent had not yet been named. The initial roster of CTPL included the following members:

Members

Mrs. Barbara D. Anderson	Secondary Teacher & former member of the Committee on Credentials
Mrs. Virginia Braun	Private Citizen
Dr. Conrad Briner	Faculty Member
Mr. John Cimolino	School Board Member
Dr. Jack E. Conner	Faculty Member

Mrs. Kathleen Crow	School Board Member
Mrs. Eunice L. Evans	Private Citizen
Dr. Thomas L. Goodman	School Administrator
Mr. Stanley Green	Private Citizen
Mrs. Marcella T. Johnson	School District Administrator
Mr. Arthur Myers	Elementary Teacher
Mrs. Elaine M. Pfeifer	Elementary Teacher
Miss Mary Ann Stewart,	Secondary Teacher
Dr. Harry O. Walker	University Faculty Member
Dr. William L. Winnet	University Faculty Member

Ex Officio Members

Dr. Horace F. Crandell	Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Mr. Robert E. Smith	Chancellor's Office, Community Colleges
Dr. Staten W. Webster	Regents of the University of California
Dr. John Baird	Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges
(Not Yet Named)	Representative of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (6: March 1971)

Four of the newly named Commissioners served together as members of the Governor's Commission on Education Reform which had been formed in June, 1969, to provide suggestions and direction to the legislation being proposed by Assemblyman Leo Ryan and other education-related legislation. The five people who had served on the Governor's Commission on Educational Reform (GCER) had a good idea of the history leading to the passage of the Ryan Act. They were certainly aware that while the GCER supported the Ryan Act, especially the independence of the Commission, the GCER was not successful in eliminating the Life Credential, nor allowing non-teaching positions to be filled by uncredentialed persons. They were also aware of the equivocal support of the California Teachers' Association (CTA) for the Ryan Act, and especially for an independent Commission; in fact, the CTA had wanted the CTPL to be completely autonomous. They would remember that the California School Boards

Association (CSBA) supported the Ryan Act, but lobbied strongly for a stricter accountability of the CTPL to the State Board, and for greater representation of laymen on the Commission.

It is probable that some of the other new Commissioners, in addition to the GCER members, were aware of the strong, sometimes hostile, position of the State Board on the proposed Ryan Act. In February, 1970, prior to final passage of the bill, the major changes demanded by the State Board before it would support Assembly Bill 122, included (12: p. 250):

- appointment of Commissioners by the State Board;
- exclusive ultimate Board control and authority over credential issuance, suspension, revocation, and program approval;
- a study “of feasibility of utilizing an examination system,” but without mandating the use of examinations; and
- no specification of maximum units of professional coursework which may be required by a college or university.

The amendments the State Board wanted were essentially the same as the college education deans and the California Council on Teacher Education had recommended. The School Administrators’ spokesperson, former Assemblymember Gordon Winton, issued a “fact sheet on AB 122” which severely criticized the bill, especially the central importance of the examination system, the nine-unit maximum on professional coursework, and the fact that it contained so many “gray areas” of confusion and uncertainty.

The first order of business was to hear from Governor Reagan; State Board of Education President, Henry Gunderson; recently elected State Superintendent Wilson Riles; and Assemblymember Leo Ryan. Governor Reagan told them that the law dramatically simplifies both standards and the processing of credentials, enables school boards to hire school superintendents who have the necessary training and experience, but do not necessarily hold

teaching or Administrative Credentials. Wilson Riles pledged support and stressed “quality” as the most important factor in education. Henry Gunderson quoted Education Code Sections 13117 and 13117.2 which establish the responsibilities of the CTPL to the State Board, and presumptuously announced that the CTPL would be provided with the goals and objectives of the Board “so the two groups could work in harmony.” Assemblymember Leo Ryan told the Commissioners, “The Commission is an independent body under the State Board which has responsibility for making decisions” (6: March, 1971).

The other business of the initial meeting included the election of John Cimolino as temporary Chairman; the appointment of a screening committee for the Executive Secretary position; a request that staff of the Department of Education provide secretarial, legal, and other staff functions to the CTPL, as provided in Code Section 13113.1 of the Ryan Act until such time as the CTPL had its own staff; a request for Ex Officio Member Crandell to work with other Commissioners and legal staff to draw up a set of operating procedures for the Commission; and an explanation by Dr. Gustafson that the Commission had \$25,000 available for expenses for the period through June 30, 1971.

Three of the key developers of the Ryan Act attended the April 15-16, 1971, meeting of the Commission to give the Commission some additional thoughts about its function and future. Dr. James Koerner told of his involvement with Assemblymember Ryan and Mr. Doyle, and how the idea for a California Commission emerged as a result of these contacts. Then, as the minutes of the April 15, 1971 meeting describe, he gave caution, advice, and some suggestions to the Commission:

Dr. Koerner advised that “the landscape is littered with advisory commissions” and that proper reform will come only from outside the professional education community. . . . Three groups must be placed into the mainstream in decision making for teacher certification reform—elementary and secondary classroom teachers, academic scholars, and laymen.

In closing, Dr. Koerner stressed:

. . . the importance of having scholars involved in moving toward reform in teacher certification. He stated that a shortcoming of the Commission was the lack of scholars among its members (6: April, 1971).

Later in the meeting, Commissioner Barbara Anderson strongly objected to Koerner's statements about the staff of the Department of Education Bureau of Certification, and Commissioner Green asked that his resentment of James Koerner's statement that there were no scholars on the Commission be placed in the minutes (6: April, 1971).

Dennis Doyle, key staff aide to Assemblymember Ryan, began his presentation by paying tribute to Dr. Koerner and his Massachusetts colleagues for the direct and unique contribution they had made toward the creation of the California Commission. Doyle stated that the major thrust of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970 were to establish two avenues through which a person could become a public school teacher in California: (1) passage of an appropriate subject matter examination, or (2) successful completion of an approved institutional subject matter program, in addition to completing a student teaching experience.

In the question and answer period, Doyle was informed that Henry T. Gunderson, President of the State Board of Education, had advised the Commission at its first meeting, that the Board would transmit a statement of its policy and general educational objectives to the Commission in accordance with Section 13117 of the law. Doyle responded by stating that this sounded ominous, and he assured the Commission that the Legislature expected it to be highly autonomous. When asked how the Commission was expected to finance, without appropriations, the development of an examination system, Doyle explained it was the belief of the Legislature that there are a number of good examinations now in use which can be adopted, and, therefore, cost was not a factor (6: April, 1971).

Lee Lowery, a key aide to state Senator Albert Rodda, described the lobbying against AB 122 as "tremendous," but now that the bill had become law, it had suddenly become "everybody's"

legislation. In answering questions about the authority of the State Board, Lowery said, “The Board cannot tell you anything. They cannot say you shall do thus or so.”

Dr. Lowery stated that the concept of a diversified or liberal arts major in the new law has been of special interest to Senator Albert Rodda for several years, and that it was first introduced in legislation by him in 1965. He described, as of special concern to Senator Rodda, that very little implementation of this major had been accomplished by colleges and universities to date. “Hopefully,” Lowery stated, “the Commission will encourage institutions to develop such majors” (6: April, 1971).

The following day, the Commission discussed and approved the following statement to be sent to the Legislature.

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 is an Act of long-range effect. The Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing is moving with care and deliberation to implement the provisions of the Act. No substantial provision of the Act has yet been put to a practical test. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 be allowed to stand without amendment until such time as need for amendment becomes apparent through the experience of the Commission, and until the Commission recommends amendment (6: April, 1971).

The Commission also heard reports from staff of the Department of Education at the April 15–16, 1971 meeting. The Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification staff prepared a written report, “Proposed Programs and Activities for the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Commission.” The Commission also heard a report from the Executive Secretary of the Committee of Credentials, Mr. Richard Shipp, who reported on the functions of the Committee of Credentials, the types of cases handled, and comparative caseload history (6: April, 1971).

At the Commission’s meeting of April 28–29, 1971, Assemblymember Leo Ryan was welcomed for the second time. He presented the historical background of teacher credentialing, and stated

that the state should not be involved in the detail of determining how teachers are trained, nor how they do their work in the classrooms of the state.

Commissioner Briner commented that although the law provides for full Commission implementation by January 1, 1973, he believed that Commission members would rather have the Commission become operative sooner than that. He asked if this could be done by assuming responsibilities for specific tasks at an earlier date. Assemblymember Ryan stated that, by resolution, the Commission was authorized to take over any part of the law; that it was up to the Commission to determine the priorities for the work to be done.

The following day the newly elected State Superintendent, Wilson Riles, addressed the Commission. Prior to and following Superintendent Riles' presentation, the Commission discussed Assembly Bill 2800, a bill sponsored by the State Board of Education, which would make the Superintendent the Executive Secretary to the Commission, and appointments to the Commission would be made by the State Board upon nomination by the State Superintendent. While the bill was claimed to be not yet in print, the discussion must have raised the level of anxiety about the context of Dr. Riles' address (6 April 28-29, 1971).

Commissioner Green asked Dr. Riles how AB 2800 would affect the Commission. Riles stated that the Commission would be advisory to the State Board, and its members would be appointed by the Board on the nomination of the State Superintendent.

Commissioner Briner stated he would like to ask Riles' opinion concerning the matter of the Commission being independent. "How do you interpret this?"

Riles stated no one is independent, and referred to the Governor and Legislature with the checks and balances which were built into our form of government. He declared that this Commission and any other commission should have the freedom to explore and advise and provide recommendations, but independence—no: we will have to work with each other.

Earlier in his presentation, Riles listed the number of functions that had been removed from the State Department during Rafferty's administration: the State College System, Vocational Rehabilitation, Community Colleges, and the Data Processing Center. Blaming the losses on mismanagement, he charged that the separations had not solved any problems. In closing he stated that:

"If you leave the Department, I will cooperate in every way possible, but you cannot expect to have top priority if you should leave" and "Nothing leaves the Department without my opposition" (6: April 28-29, 1971).

The Commissioners must have been puzzled by Riles' statement, "If you leave . . ." Even though they were meeting in the Department of Education building, and relying on State Department of Education staff, as per Education Code Section 13113.1, the Commissioners had been told by Ryan, Koerner, Doyle, and Lowery, in no uncertain terms, that the Commission was an independent body, other than that the Commission's proposed Title Regulations must be approved by the State Board after January 1, 1973. Prior to that you may "declare all or selected provisions of the Teacher Preparation Law of 1970 to be in effect by resolution" (Section 93 of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970).

At the May, 1971 meeting, the Chairman of the Screening Committee for the executive secretary position reported that 167 applications had been received from individuals in 36 states. A list of seven strong candidates had been selected for further interviews. The Committee had selected three from those candidates for final interview by the Commission. After interviewing the three candidates in Executive Session, the Commission reopened the meeting and announced the appointment of Dr. George Gustafson as the Executive Secretary.

By the May 1971 meeting, the Commissioners had been advised by Ryan, Doyle, Koerner, and Lowery about their general responsibilities, and by Carl Larson and Blair Hurd of the more specific responsibilities related to licensing and accreditation. Dennis Doyle had alerted the Commissioners to the time frame of implementing the Ryan Act as stated in Sections 92 and 93 of that Act. They knew that the Ryan Act was to be operative on or before January 1, 1973, later

extended to July 1, 1973. They were also aware that they could make operational any section of the Ryan Act before July 1, 1973, simply by passing a resolution. Title 5 Regulations could follow later.

By the May, 1971 meeting, the Commissioners were also aware of their powers and duties, described in Section 13114 (see Appendix). These powers and duties formed the basis for the formation of committees and the responsibilities of those committees.

At the May, 1971 meeting, Jack Conner, elected Chair of the April meeting, stated that the work of the Commission would be done in large part through committees. He asked for volunteers to the committees, and on the basis of choice he named the following committees to begin the work of the Commission: the Teacher Education Programs Committee, the Examinations Committee, the Identification of Personnel Committee, and the Budget Committee. During the next few months, he established committees on Licensing, the Evaluation of Teaching Competence, the Committee of Credentials, and the Teaching of Reading (6: May 1971).

The Teacher Education Programs Committee and the Evaluation of Teaching Competence Committee were assigned the task of developing standards for the paper and on-site approval of programs of professional preparation; the Examinations Committee was assigned the dual tasks of developing standards for the Verification of Subject Matter Knowledge, via passage of an examination or through completion of a Commission-approved subject matter program; the Committee on the Teaching of Reading was responsible for developing standards for the “knowledge of teaching reading” requirement for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Authorizations; the Identification of Personnel Committee was responsible for developing procedures to identify people to serve on the Committee of Credentials, and to serve on advisory panels to recommend standards and procedures for the certification of educational personnel; the Committee on Credentials was responsible to set procedures for the transition of the Committee of Credentials from the Department of Education to the Commission; the Licensing Committee was responsible for establishing procedures for the receipt of all credential applications, and for the issuance of credentials based on college recommendations or on direct application.

During the beginning meetings, the Commissioners heard comments from the various presenters that must have been confusing, as well as comments that, in the future, would prove to be inaccurate.

All of the Commissioners were aware of the multitude of tasks, and the tight time frame for the completion of those tasks.

DEVELOPING A SYSTEM FOR THE STAFF REVIEW AND ON-SITE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

The statutes required the Commission to establish guidelines for institutions to follow in program development; to review and approve the program document submitted by the college; and, at a later date, to complete an on-site evaluation of the program of professional preparation. In the future, in 1971, there were twelve teaching and services authorizations which a California accredited institution of higher education (IHE) could offer its candidates. Programs for these twelve authorizations needed to be operational by September 15, 1974.

The Teacher Education Committee, chaired by Commissioner Mary Ann Stewart, was faced with resolving the conflict in the statutes between the preamble calling for “broad minimum standards” and the powers and duties specifying “objective, independently variable standards of measurement and evaluation of teaching competence.” The Committee elected to develop guidelines that followed the more prescriptive competency-based model of teacher education. There were a number of reasons for this decision in addition to the existing movement toward performance-based teacher education throughout much of the United States. Ryan, in the San Francisco meeting leading up to the passage of his bill, pointed out that teachers will have the “opportunity and responsibility to demonstrate that teaching performance is measurable in terms acceptable to the teaching profession” (12: p. 156). Ryan’s intent was clearly contained in the powers and duties section of the statutes.

The direction toward performance-based teacher education was evidenced in a number of other ways. In May, 1971, following a presentation by members of the Department of Education's Committee on Accreditation, Chairman Conner stated:

The emphasis of the Commission should be primarily on the results of teacher preparation programs rather than upon what is happening on university and

college campuses. The Commission's role may be best expressed through the medium of examinations and behavioral objectives (6: May, 1971).

At the December, 1971 Commission meeting, it was agreed that the Executive Secretary be directed to develop guidelines for appraising teacher performance as it relates to licensing which is required of the Commission in the Ryan Act. It was specified that the language of such guidelines be constructed in such a way that "lay people may understand" (6: December, 1971).

From mid-1971 through mid-1972, the Committees on Teaching Reading and the Evaluation of Teaching Competency had also been studying the issue of evaluating teaching competence. In October, 1971, J. Alden Vanderpool, the CTA representative, made brief comments on what colleges were doing relative to evaluating teacher competence. In November, 1971, following a report on interstate reciprocity, it was pointed out that the concept of performance standards could take care of much of the apprehension concerning interstate agreements. During this same time, the Commission was attempting to interest private foundations and federal funding sources to determine those teacher competencies crucial to the teaching of reading to disadvantaged youth. The move to a performance-based model of teacher preparation seems to have been a conscious and unanimous Commission decision.

The general and specific guidelines for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Authorizations were the first to be developed. These guidelines were developed mainly by Commissioner Stewart and Commission staff. The general guidelines included:

- 1.0 - Institutional Requirements;
- 2.0 - Professional Course Requirements;
- 3.0 - Student Teaching Requirements;
- 4.0 - Professional Competence Requirements; and
- 5.0 - Reading Course Requirements.

Each of the general guidelines included many specific guidelines. For example, Guideline 1.0 - Institutional Requirements required the institution to do the following:

- provide for participation in program planning by teachers and the lay public;
- provide staff development for staff and cooperating (master) teachers;
- provide adequate staff, material, and faculty allocations;
- provide for a systemic program of advising and counseling;
- provide for a final review of each candidate's performance; and
- develop a plan for systematic evaluation of candidates and graduates.

Guideline 4.0 left little doubt about the Commission's position on performance-based teacher education:

Teacher preparation programs are recently moving in the direction of competency-based instruction programs . . . programs aimed at developing professional competencies of teachers are encouraged to move in this direction.

(6: June, 1972).

The Commission selected advisory groups to develop the guidelines for the other ten programs of professional preparation. However, the general guidelines 1.0, 2.0, and 4.0 were to be included in the guidelines for all programs of professional preparation. The task of the advisory group was to develop the specific guidelines, appropriate to the teaching or services authorization for which the group was responsible. Each advisory group included college faculty, public school educators, and members of the lay public, all of whom had expertise related to the appointed task.

Following the Commission's approval of guidelines, they were sent to the field for review and written response prior to a public hearing. Following the public hearing and adoption, the

Commission staff developed a manual for each specific program of professional preparation. The manual included the general and specific guidelines, along with examples, explanations, and classifications. The manuals were distributed to the IHEs, and Commission staff members were assigned to IHEs to assist in their development of programs of professional preparation. The documents which the IHEs were to submit to the Commission were to be titled “The Program Approval and Review Document” (PARD) for the specified teaching or services authorization.

The Staff Review (Approval) Process

In March, 1973, the Commission adopted procedures for the review and approval (or rejection) of the PARDs. Each staff consultant was to review each PARD in accordance with the Commission’s guidelines. Staff was to prepare one staff recommendation for each PARD for submission to the Teacher Education Committee for recommendation to the full Commission. In addition, every Commissioner was assigned at least one PARD for review and information.

By January, 1974, the Commission had approved 40 single subject and 40 multiple subject programs of professional preparation. The Commission had received an additional 19 single subject and 19 multiple subject PARDs. Two-hundred one (201) specialist and services programs were being developed, but none had yet been received by the Commission for review.

The Commission had the authority to add additional Specialist Instruction Authorizations and did so by adding the Agriculture Specialist and Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist in 1973. Other authorizations requiring legislation were added, including a bilingual/crosscultural emphasis that could be added as an authorization to a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Authorization; a Bilingual Certificate of Competence, a Visually Handicapped Specialist Instruction Authorization, and several others. In each case, the Commission developed guidelines and manuals, assisted in program development, reviewed and approved the final PARD. Some higher education faculty suggested that this was a lengthy and time-consuming task for staff of the IHEs and Commission alike.

In May, 1973, the Commission received the first written criticism of the guidelines for programs of professional preparation. The academic assembly of the Sonoma State College School of Arts and Sciences declared:

That the Teacher Licensing and Credentialing Law of 1970, as interpreted by the Commission and/or staff and provisionally implemented by the proposed professional programs, places severe restrictions upon the development of academic single subject and multiple subject majors which must be designed to further implement provisions of the Ryan Act, and that these restrictions create serious reservations about the quality of training, both academic and professional (6: May, 1971).

Implied in the Sonoma criticism was the concern for the nine-unit limit on professional coursework. According to Dennis Doyle, imposing the nine-unit limit had met heavy opposition:

Schools of education saw the Ryan Act as a direct threat to their very existence. The limit to the number of courses that could be required as prerequisites to admission to student teaching proved particularly galling to the schools of education since it reduced much of their power leverage (2: p. 265).

However, the first indication that the members of the California Legislature expressed a concern about the balance between subject matter preparation and professional preparation came from a 1976 Ryan Act Task Force interim report:

Further, the question of subject matter competency vs. practical classroom ability has prompted lengthy discussions. The Task Force members question whether or not teaching qualities are being underemphasized. Should oral and/or practical classroom examinations, internships, and in-service training requirements be broadened? (4: page 2)

This report was a small break through. However, it must have been a very welcomed response by teacher educators who remembered the days of the education major of the 1950s, and the continual emphasis on subject matter preparation since the passage of the Fisher Act in 1961.

In mid-1974, the Department of Finance completed a program review of the Commission, conducted as part of its ongoing evaluation cycle. The objective of the study was to provide the information needed to make sound and rational decisions regarding the future role and direction of the CTPL. The report of the program review criticized the Commission for not having a majority of programs of professional preparation operational by September 15, 1974. The report recommended that the Commission grant interim approval to programs of professional preparation upon the certification of the president of the institution that the program complies with Commission guidelines, and that the Commission streamline the process for reviewing PARDs, which was done. The Commission responded to the first recommendation by seeking and securing legislation to extend the September 15, 1974, date to September 15, 1976, and extending the approval date of Fisher programs to correspond to the 1976 date. In February, 1976, the ex officio member representing the UC system, Dr. Gary Fenstermacher, spoke to the concern of the UC system regarding the program approval process (16: p. 20-23):

This concern arises out of the complexity of the manuals for program approval. It is recommended that the Commission undertake a simplification of the program review and approval process. Simplifying the program approval process and the External Assessment process should be one of the major tasks to face this Commission over the next year or two (6: February, 1976).

In May, 1976, Fenstermacher again raised concerns about the program approval process with the following statement:

Has the Commission adopted a single philosophy of teacher education? Although the public posture of the Commission is that it does not officially subscribe to a particular philosophy of teacher education, an examination of the Commission's program manuals indicates that the Commission is on record as

supporting performance-based teacher education—to the exclusion of many other approaches to the preparation of teachers. Thus it appears that the Commission has adopted, de facto, a behaviorist philosophy of education. Is the Commission willing to be on record as committed to a single philosophy? Is this unidimensional philosophy commitment consistent with the intent and spirit of the Ryan Act? Is it proper for this agency to commit itself to an exclusive philosophical position on the education of teachers? Should we not concern ourselves with the encouragement of diversity, with a rich range of program philosophies? (6: May 1976)

By June, 1976, 204 programs of professional preparation had been approved. The approval of multiple subjects and single subject programs with a bilingual/crossculture emphasis had been approved in 14 institutions, and 3 local educational agencies (syn: school district or county offices of education) had been approved to evaluate applicants for Designated Subjects Credentials, and to provide in-service education for holders of a Designated Subjects Credentials. By June, 1978, the Commission had approved 507 programs of professional preparation at 70 institutions, including 171 multiple and single subject programs, 319 specialist or services programs, and 17 local education agencies for Designated Subjects Teaching Authorizations.

At the March, 1978, Commission meeting, the issue of “encouragement of diversity” was again raised by the Ex Officio Commissioner Dr. Irv Hendrick, who had replaced Gary Fenstermacher, when he said to the Commission:

Although the Commission does provide for experimental programs, and theoretically all institutions are free to submit such programs under this policy, I fear that the substantial effort to reorient teacher education toward the competency-based behavioral psychology model, and the corresponding rejection of other models, in the early part of this decade may have helped produce a long-term debilitating effect on institutional attempts to build distinctive programs (6: March, 1978).

External Assessment: On-Site Approval of Programs

The second stage of the Commission's program approval system was called External Assessment. This process was named External Assessment because the members of the on-site team were external to both the Commission and the IHE undergoing the assessment.

The Commission's introduction to the on-site review of programs of professional preparation occurred at the May, 1971 meeting. Dr. Jim Stone, Chair of the State Board of Education's Accreditation Committee, brought members of the Committee to the meeting. Using a fictitious name for a college that had been though an on-site visit, Stone and the members explained the accreditation procedures. Following the presentation, one of the Commissioners expressed the hope that "the Commission would not add another elaborate campus visitation procedure to the one already carried on by the Department's Accreditation Committee" (6: May, 1971).

The Department's Accreditation Committee continued to do on-site visits during the 1971-72 school year. The Commission, at the request of the State Board of Education, requested funds for the Accreditation Committee to continue on-site visits in the 1972-73 school year. However, the Department of Finance denied the request. In December, 1972, the State Board passed a resolution which recognized the Commission as the agency now responsible for accreditation; terminated the Accreditation Committee as of December 15, 1972; and praised the work of the Accreditation Committee and all who had served on accreditation teams during the thirty-year history of the Department's accreditation efforts. In January, 1973, the Commission granted approval until September, 1974, of all previously accredited programs. Later, the Commission successfully sought legislation which authorized them to approve those (Fisher Act) programs to September, 1976.

In January, 1975, the Commission held an External Assessment Design Conference. Persons from identifiable constituencies of teacher preparation programs, state and national accreditation bodies, and specialists in evaluation were invited. The participants of the Design Conference

recommended process standards for a discrepancy model of program evaluation; the on-site team of assessors would determine how closely the college had implemented the program submitted to and approved by the Commission. The recommendation for the discrepancy model of program evaluation was approved by the Commission, along with other recommendations regarding the composition of the on-site teams, the procedures for gathering information, and the format for reporting findings to the IHE and the Commission.

Four IHEs went through Pilot Phase I of External Assessment in February and March of 1975: UC, Irvine; Sonoma State College; CSU, Long Beach; and Point Loma College. In April, representatives of the four IHEs and members of the on-site teams made a presentation to the Commission of their perceptions of the External Assessment process. Dr. Brian Shears, Chairman of the Sonoma State College's Department of Education, was the most critical of the External Assessment process when he told the Commission:

Sonoma was the first institution to become involved with the External Assessment process. It was too hasty a process, poor communication and organization . . . rating scales are confusion, and there are erroneous ratings . . . written report was disappointing in quality and erroneous in content . . . faculty members' complaints focused on the untrained, unprepared evaluators . . . what is needed is better planning sessions and training . . . the institution did receive constructive criticism (6: April 1975).

The representatives of the other three IHEs—Dr. John Nelson of CSU, Long Beach, Dr. Ken Bailey of UC Irvine, and Dr. Philip Fitch of Point Loma College—expressed some of the same concerns as Dr. Shears. There was agreement among all four about the lack of training of the assessors, need for a better time frame for completing the assessment, and a need for improved communication with all involved in the process. They also made positive points about external assessment. Dr. Bailey told the Commission:

The External Assessment is miles ahead of anything he has ever been involved with. Concepts are good . . . basically effective for staff in-service (6: April 1975).

The members of the on-site teams found fault with the time required to do interviewing, the interview form, the lack of communication from the Commission staff as to the time the assessment process would take, and the difficulty of securing information from candidates, some of whom were still in Fisher programs, and some of whom were in Ryan programs. The members of the on-site teams were pleased that their constituency (student, teacher, administrator, college faculty) were included on the teams (6: April 1975).

There were other critics of the external assessment process who questioned a system that measured the degree to which the college's program met the Commission's guidelines, but did not measure the quality of individual candidates. There were also critics of the guidelines as being too prescriptive. It was a time that the Commission felt that it desperately needed a successful External Assessment effort. However, the results of Pilot Phase I of External Assessment "hurt the Commission's credibility at a time when it needed it most" (15: p. 52).

Following the presentations of Pilot Phase I, the Commission directed staff to develop plans for Pilot Phase II. A redesign conference of institutional and constituency spokespersons, acting upon the results and evaluation of the first pilot year, developed plans for a second pilot year during which the multiple and single subject programs at nine IHEs would be assessed.

Following the External Assessment of the nine IHEs, staff summarized the activities involved and everything learned in Pilot Phase II into a final report that also included recommendations and implementation of Pilot Phase III. This report was presented to the Commissioners in June, 1976, for their review prior to a presentation to the full Commission by those involved in Pilot Phase II at the July meeting. Those speaking to the Commission at the July meeting had also received a copy of the final report. Following the presentation, a question was raised about a request from the field for a moratorium on External Assessment. Representatives of two institutions which had been assessed in Pilot Phase II, Dr. Joe Shieffer of CSU, Northridge and

Sister Alice Tabriner of the College of Notre Dame, indicated that “most of the problems experienced by the teams have been met in plans for Pilot Phase III” (6: July 1976).

In August, 1976, Blair Hurd was promoted to Director of Teacher Education and Licensing, and Dr. Richard Mastain was named the New Chief of Programs. Dr. Mastain's first task was to hire a person to coordinate the External Assessment process. Dr. Hurd, Dr. LoPresti, and Dr. Mastain agreed to hire Dr. Philip Fitch of Point Loma College. Dr. Fitch's college had been through external assessment, he had served as an on-site team member in Pilot Phase II, he was respected by his teacher educator colleagues, and he had excellent people skills. In brief, he would help to build trust in the External Assessment process.

The recommendations and implementation of Pilot Phase III were approved by the Commission. These recommendations included a quality dimension in External Assessment that would be reported to the IHE, but not considered in determining approval of the program. Other recommendations included the assessment team structure (eight persons to assess each program); the identification of four priority areas (community and institutional resources, advising and evaluation, field experiences, and professional competencies); institutional alternatives (the option to propose alterations of assessment); building an assessor pool and minimizing potential conflict; the assessment time frame; the report development process; the training process; and the development of an *Assessment Handbook*.

In September, 1976, workshops were held in northern and southern California for institutions of higher education participating in Pilot Phase III. During Pilot Phase III, 58 credential programs, including multiple and single subject, and specialist and services were assessed at 12 IHEs. Commissioners Jack Evans, Mary Ann Stewart, Harold Wilson, and Leo Cain observed External Assessment first hand at one or two of the twelve institutions. The Chair of the Programs Committee, Stanley Green, observed external assessment at three IHEs, and told the Commission at the May, 1976 meeting, “The Commission is being well served by this process” (6: May 1977). The comments of the other Commissioners who had observed during Pilot Phase III were also very positive. Commissioner Stewart, who had worked with staff in developing the *Assessment Handbook*, attended the External Assessment at the University of the Pacific and

“found it fascinating.” She also commended the staff for their “admirable restraint with difficult situations” (6: May 1977).

Pilot Phase III was considered by the Commission as a success, and this was based on the quality of the reports and first-hand observation by many Commissioners.

Seventy-five (75) programs at 13 IHEs went through External Assessment in 1977-78, and 8 programs at four were reassessed. The Commissioners continued to observe the process and, with a few exceptions, thought the process continued to be good to excellent. The comments from the IHEs being assessed were generally positive, although not as laudatory as that of Dr. Philip Vairo, Dean of the School of Education at CSU, Los Angeles:

The assessment process was managed par excellence by Dr. Fitch. . . . We are also indebted to Dr. Sid Inglis . . . as our staff consultant and the expertise he provided during external assessment.

Commissioner Raquel Muir, following her experience as Co-Chairman of a National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) evaluation team, reported to the Commission: “The Commission is doing an exemplary job in external assessment” (6: April 1978).

However, critics of external assessment, both within and outside the Commission, were emerging. In April, 1978, Commissioner Carolyn Denham, herself a university administrator, asked that the Commission reconsider its discrepancy model for external assessment. She suggested that assessors look for discrepancies between programs and Commission guidelines, rather than discrepancies between approved program plans and the present operation of the program. Several members of the Legislature had expressed concerns about the size of the visiting teams, the cost to the Commission and the IHEs, and the lack of the Commission's evaluation of the performance of program graduates. At the August, 1978 meeting, the Commission was told that the control language in the 1978–79 budget recommended that the Commission submit to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee an adequate plan by October 1,

1978, “to evaluate programs and performance of persons credentialed by the Commission” (6: August 1978).

Much of the criticism within the Legislature stemmed from a member of the Legislative Analyst's staff who had observed one external assessment for part of a day. Given the concerns raised by Commissioner Denham and the Legislature, and at the suggestion of the Legislative Analyst, the Commission entered into a special series of small research contracts with Dr. Michael Scriven, Director of the Evaluation Institute at the University of San Francisco. The research was to take place during the 1978–79 year of external assessment.

The coordination of external assessment during the 1978–79 year was assigned to CTPL staff member, Dr. David Greene, following the completion of Dr. Fitch’s two-year leave of absence from Point Loma College. The work load was reduced to the assessment of 44 programs at 22 colleges. Of these, 25 programs underwent initial assessment and 19 programs were reassessed.

In November, 1978, Dr. Denham presented a paper to the Commission regarding her views of what external assessment should be. She had also presented her proposal to the members of the California Council on the Education of Teachers at its annual meeting the preceding month. Executive Secretary LoPresti assigned staff members Dr. Alan Jones, Dr. Paul Finkbeiner, and Dr. Robert Kane to work with Dr. Denham in preparing a staff analysis of her proposal (6: November 1978).

In early 1978, the Commission received an analysis of the Agency’s 1979–80 budget by the office of the Legislative Analyst. The analysis was critical of several aspects of the Commission’s operation, including external assessment. Staff believed the analysis was flawed and Blair Hurd and several other staff members prepared a 60–page statement outlining the perceived errors and biased statements of the Legislative Analyst staff member who prepared the report. (The same one who had spent a half-day observing external assessment.) Executive Secretary LoPresti reported the following to the Commission in April, 1979:

The detailed response to the analysis which we prepared, and which was shared with you at the last Commission meeting, has served as a very constructive vehicle for a series of meetings we have had with the Legislative Analyst, staff from the Department of Finance, and the Legislative budget committees, as well as several key legislators.

Chuck Moss, Dick Mastain, and I met personally with Mr. William G. Hamm, the Legislative Analyst, and members of his staff, and carefully reviewed all of the issues raised in the analysis by that office. . . . We have been able to work out a series of recommendations for the 1979–80 budget which are far more agreeable and equitable to our agency (6: April 1979).

However, the Commission was directed by budget control language to again submit an external assessment redesign plan by December 31, 1979, with the stipulation that the redesign must be approved by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance prior to that date in order for the Commission to spend funds on external assessment beyond January 1, 1980 (6: April 1979).

In July, 1979, the Commission approved a plan entitled “Developmental Activities for 1979–80 Assessment.” The plan included plans for a Critical Analysis Workshop to be held August 15–18, 1979. Participants for the Critical Analysis Workshop were selected for their established reputation in the field of program evaluation. The format for the Critical Analysis Workshop was to devote days one and two to the critical analysis of the Scriven reports, the Denham proposal, and staff recommendations. Day three was a joint meeting between members of the evaluation group, members of the CTPL Programs Committee, Scriven, and staff to allow the evaluation group to present their conclusions and recommendations and allow for discussion by all parties involved.

Following the Critical Analysis Workshop, staff worked with a cadre of the evaluators (an evaluation advisory board) to develop the External Assessment and Redesign Plan. Commission staff submitted the Plan to the Programs Committee and members of the evaluation advisory

board in September following revisions, the Plan was approved by the Programs Committee in October, adopted by the Commission in November, and submitted to the Legislature and Department of Finance in mid-November, 1979.

In December, 1979, CTPL Coded Correspondence 79-8035, "Plans for Program Approval and Evaluation," was sent to the field. The Plan, reflecting many of the recommendations from the Critical Analysis Workshop, and including recommendations from Commissioner Denham's proposal, focused on three major components:

- the evaluation will be carried out by small teams of external constituents and based on compliance with Commission requirements considered absolutely necessary for the preparation of public school personnel;
- the evaluation of the preparation of graduates of programs and their performance, required of all preparation institutions and monitored by the Commission; and
- a program document, reduced to those requirements considered to be absolutely necessary for the preparation of public school personnel.

In January, 1980, the Commission held regional workshops to explain in detail all aspects of the Plan and related changes in Commission policies and procedures. The response to the Redesign Plan was positive from the Legislature, the Department of Finance, teacher preparation faculty, and the Commission's constituent organizations.

DEVELOPING MEASURES FOR THE VERIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE

The Ryan Act provided for two ways to verify subject matter knowledge: the primary avenue was passage of a subject matter examination. The secondary avenue was the completion of a subject matter program approved by the Commission. The Commission's task was twofold: (1) to develop an examination system; and (2) to set standards for the development and approval of subject matter programs.

Developing an Examination System Without Funds

The original intent of Leo Ryan and Dennis Doyle was to have every applicant for a teaching credential verify subject matter knowledge by passing an examination. However, other legislators, such as Senators Rodda and Dymally, would not support AB 122 (the Ryan Act) unless there was an alternate avenue to verify subject matter knowledge. The California Teachers' Association would only support an examination system if there was also an alternate route. The alternate route became the completion of a subject matter program at an institution of higher education approved by the Commission. The alternative to the examination was called a "waiver" program because it waived the examination for the applicant.

The two major tasks were assigned to the Examination Committee. The goal of the Examinations Committee and the Commission was to complete these two tasks by the operative date of the Ryan Act—July 1, 1973. The Commission was also cognizant of the date of September 15, 1974, at which time students who could not reasonably complete the requirements for a "Fisher Act" Credential became subject to the provisions of the Ryan Act. The Examination Committee's work plan included the formation of an advisory panel to develop a "Scope and Content" statement for each subject field in which the statutes required an examination.

The Commission invited nominations for advisory panels from the institutions of higher education, district and county superintendents, teacher-related organizations, legislators, the California PTA, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the NAACP, California Indian Educators Association, National Urban League, the Association of Mexican American Educators, the Japanese-American Citizen League, the Intertribal Council of California, and other interested citizens (6: Nov. 1971).

From more than 500 nominations, the Commission selected advisory panels to develop Scope and Content Statements for the Multiple Subjects Teaching Authorization, for each of the eleven Single Subject Teaching Authorizations, for the Administrative Services and the Pupil Personnel Services Authorizations, and for the Knowledge of Teaching Reading requirement. Additional advisory panels were added in 1973 when the Legislature separated the Physical and Natural Science Single Subject Credential into Physical Science Single Subject and Life Science Single Subject. Also, in 1973, one of the members of the advisory panel for the Social Science Scope and Content, Assemblymember Mike Antonovich, proposed legislation, which was passed, to add two additional single subjects, History and Government. Legislation in 1974 added Agriculture as a single subject, bringing the total to fifteen single subjects.

Subject Matter Advisory Panels were charged to submit their recommendations regarding the existence or absence of suitable examination by January, 1973 (9: 1971-72).

Upon the completion of each Scope and Content Statement by an advisory panel and acceptance by the Examination Committee and the Commission, a public hearing was held. Following the public hearing, the Commission either adopted the Scope and Content Statement or returned it for revision. After the Scope and Content was formally adopted by the Commission, an advisory panel was asked to review the examinations in the Commission offices to determine the existence or absence of a suitable examination. Early on, the Commission had established the Exam and Measurement Panel, a group of test experts, to also review the Scope and Content Statements and assist in the review of possible examinations.

In July, 1971, the Examination Committee directed staff to do a survey of existing examinations. On the basis of that survey, 25 publishers were contacted and 223 examinations were acquired for review by the advisory panels. Very few of the advisory panels were satisfied with an existing examination and recommended that new examinations be developed. An exception was the Multiple Subjects' Advisory Panel, which found one examination that came close to matching the Scope and Content Statement. A documented analysis of the Commons Examination of the National Teacher's Examination indicated that, with strengthening, the examination possessed the potential for use (6: Dec. 1971). Also, the advisory panel to develop a Scope and Content Statement (SCS) for the Teaching of Reading Examination, recommended the adoption of an existing examination. The Commission concurred and the examination was adopted, with slight changes, with the contractor bearing the cost of modification. As of January, 1974, two examinations were available for utilization on an interim basis; nine SCSs had been adopted; three SCSs were about to go to a public hearing; two advisory panels, mathematics and social science, had been replaced with newly selected advisory panels who were now in the early stages; two advisory panels, history and government, were just beginning; and one advisory panel, agriculture, was yet to be selected.

The Commission recognized the inadequacy of existing examinations, in 1971. To address this concern, the Commission requested that its 1972–73 budget include a general loan fund to develop examinations. These funds were not provided, and the Commission was faced with adopting an interim plan.

In June, 1972, the Commission issued a request-for-proposals (RFP) to administer an examination system. In December, 1972, a contract to administer the examination system was signed with the Educational Testing System (ETS), owners of the National Teacher Examination (NTE). In July, 1973, the Commission adopted the National Teachers Examinations for the interim Examination System “with the proviso that the Commission may replace those examinations with others at any time in the future” (6: June 1973).

In October, 1973, the common and area examinations of the NTE were adopted for use through December, 1974. Each succeeding year thereafter through 1979, the Commission due to a lack of funding for an alternative solution had little choice but to adopt the NTE for another year.

In adopting the National Teacher Examinations, the Commission was disappointed with the lack of match between the SCSs and the area examinations. The disappointment was magnified by the fact that the carefully selected advisory panels had worked with diligence and dedication, and yet the efforts of the advisory panels, the Examination Committee, and the Commission had resulted in a less than satisfactory product. The Commission recognized that a large chunk of its credibility rested on the perceived effectiveness of the examination system. The Commissioners must have remembered Doyle's response to a Commissioner's question at the April, 1971 meeting, of how the Commission was expected to finance an examination system. Doyle explained, "It was the belief of the Legislature that there are a number of good examinations now in use which can be adopted" (6: April 1971).

Individuals and organizations which had severely criticized the concept of an examination system prior to the passage of AB 122 were often ready to say "I told you so." James Koerner, who supported a system of qualifying examinations which would demonstrate field mastery, wanted an examination system that would require "an emphasis on the essay and demonstration examination." Koerner discussed the National Teacher Examinations, and found them severely lacking: "If a better instrument than the NTE cannot be developed for examining prospective teachers, perhaps we should abandon the whole idea" (11: p. 252).

Criticism of the slowly developing examination system was not confined to critics outside of the Commission. In May, 1972, CTPL Chairman Conner was already admitting the limitations of the examination system.

. . . Our advisers say that none of the tests they have studied are good enough. Maybe some new ones will have to be invented. For the time being we will use examinations that already exist, just to get going; we have to be ready with the whole series of examinations before July, 1973. Meanwhile, we will be searching for better exams, and maybe making up new ones.

The first thing that comes to mind is the machine-graded multiple-choice test. Its best feature is its speed of reporting grades. Its second best feature is that it can't know the examinee personally. There's a lot of opposition to tests of that

kind, because some say that they test facts but not understanding. Having made up tests for many years, and having taken tests of all kinds, I have little confidence in any test. Some of the machine– graded ones aren't bad. It depends on the mind of the maker (1: p. 23).

In 1972, the Commission requested funds for fiscal year 1973–74 to develop examinations. Those funds were made available in the form of a loan of \$342,000. It was estimated this amount would be needed to modify some examinations and to develop new ones where no existing examinations were available. Some bids were received but because the actual costs were double the anticipated costs, the Commission rejected all bids and decided to use the NTE program on a two–year interim basis. The unexpectedly high cost of developing examinations caused the Commission to significantly alter its examination specifications in an attempt to lower costs.

In September, 1974, the Commission received a strong message from the legislative conference committee in response to a request for examination development funds:

It is recommended that the Commission curtail its expensive examination development program in favor of a program directed towards modifying existing examinations.

And that:

The Commission administer such examinations as a secondary alternative, rather than as the primary system for credentialing teachers (6: September, 1974).

About the same time the Commission received a report from the Department of Finance. The report was the result of a program review of the CTPL, and was conducted as a part of the ongoing evaluation cycle by the Department of Finance, intending to serve as a status report of the implementation of the Ryan Act. The Department of Finance recommendations related to the Examination System included the following:

In the case of reading, an existing examination was adopted with slight changes with the contractor bearing the cost of modification. We recommend the Commission further negotiate with contractors to obtain similar conditions for the remaining examinations. If the contractors are unwilling to absorb the cost of modifying existing examinations, we recommend the Commission adopt existing examinations without modifications until demand and legal ramifications can be determined on an empirical basis (16: p. 19).

However disappointing the recommendations of the conference committee and the Department of Finance were, the Commission continued to request funds from the Legislature for examination development. The only success was the authorization in 1975–76 to budget \$50,000 from its own Teacher’s Credential Fund to develop an examination for the Agriculture Single Subject. There were no acceptable examinations in history or government and none were developed.

The Commission established passing standards for each section of the Commons Examination of the NTE in January 1973, and an overall passing score for all these sections. The composite score was later dropped and a liberal appeal policy was adopted.

In November, 1974, the Commission adopted passing standards for the area examinations at the scaled score representing the 50th percentile of the national data supplied by Educational Testing Service (6: November, 1975).

Prior to the adoption of the passing standards, a member of the Examinations Committee expressed the frustration that many other commissioners must have felt:

Committee adoption of this recommendation was done with great pain and suffering—with no confidence that we were making a permanent decision that was correct. It seemed that some decision was necessary and that this was the best one we could come to at this time. We are not making this recommendation

with any enthusiasm, and we are hoping to accumulate an experience table that will induce us to change it if appropriate in the near future (6: November, 1975).

In light of the Commission's concern about the efficacy of the passing standards, it also adopted a liberal appeal policy for the area examinations. The foreword of the appeal process conveyed a message of empathy by stating:

Recognizing that on some occasions, individuals who in fact have "minimum subject matter knowledge" are unable to achieve a passing score on Commission adopted examinations, and recognizing that minimum subject matter knowledge may be demonstrated in any number of ways, the following criteria will be included in the appeal process (6: June, 1976).

The Department of Finance Report to the Commission in 1974 had carried warnings about legal opposition to the examinations. The Commission and the Educational Testing Service both recognized the need for studies to validate the examinations. In 1976, the CTPL approved \$20,000 for a study to establish valid cut-off scores (6: November, 1976).

In the spring of 1977, the Commission began a limited validity study of the common examinations, and three area examinations. Ninety (90) public school teachers and 142 college professors from throughout the state were called together to review test items on two counts: (1) does the item relate to the adopted Scope and Content Statement; and (2) does the test item require knowledge that is crucial to the teaching of the subject in question? Additional validity studies were conducted in 1978, and 1979, of the most frequently used examinations. The results of these validity studies indicated a high correlation between the content of the examinations and the Scope and Content Statements; and that the examinations did measure the knowledge areas for which they were offered (9: 1977–78, 1978–79).

In early 1979, the Commission adopted new and significantly different Title 5 Regulations for appeal upon failure to pass a subject matter examination. The new appeal regulations, much more stringent than the initial ones, enabled an applicant who had failed a subject matter

examination to file a petition of appeal on the grounds of fraud, discrimination, clerical error in scoring, or other improper acts or circumstances related to the administration of the examination. The regulations also allowed an applicant who failed a subject matter examination, and who did not meet the appeal standards outlined above, to request to be examined by a board of examiners. The new appeal provisions seemed to reflect the Commission's increasing confidence that the cut-off scores, based on five years' experience, were correct, or at least very close (CTPL Coded Correspondence No. 78-7951, April, 1979).

In May, 1979, the Commission adopted Title 5 Regulations that required every applicant for a Single Subject Credential in French, German, or Spanish to pass an oral proficiency examination; every applicant for a Single Subject Credential in English to pass a writing proficiency examination; and every applicant for a basic teaching credential who had not been recommended for such credential by a Commission-approved college to pass an English writing proficiency examination.

During the period July, 1974, through June 30, 1979, a total of 75,000 candidates took examinations as a possible route to qualify for a California Teaching or Administrative Services Credential. Approximately 29,000 of those candidates scored at a level where they could use the examination results as the basis for receiving a credential or receiving an added authorization to an existing credential.

The examination system incurred only a few legislative changes during the 1970s. In 1979, statutes were passed to eliminate the examination route for the Administrative Services Credential, legislation that had been proposed in 1975 by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and by the CTPL in November, 1976.

During the years 1971-79, hundreds of public school teachers, administrators, college and university faculty, and lay citizens served on advisory panels, and hundreds more attended one of the 30 public hearings held on Scope and Content Statements and other examination related issues. In order to keep its constituents informed, the Commission mailed over 60 separate pieces of examination related correspondence to an audience of more than 2,000 individuals,

school districts, county offices, college deans and presidents, education-related organizations, and interested citizens.

In 1994, Dick Mastain, former Executive Secretary of the agency, reflected:

“Whatever judgment is made of the examination system, the Commission acted decisively, openly, forthrightly, and with dedication to purpose; even though the Commission recognized, probably more so than anyone else, the shortcomings of the NTE. The Commission and its staff learned a great deal during those years about the strengths and weaknesses of the examination system, learning that, perhaps one day, would lead to an examination system that included a variety of assessment procedures, including essay type questions and demonstration of performance.”

Policies for the Development and Approval of Subject Matter (Waiver) Programs

The Ryan Act specified that the Commission would “waive” the subject matter examination when the candidate completed a Commission–approved subject matter program. These included the diversified liberal studies program for the Multiple Subjects Authorization, and the subject matter programs for all of the Single Subject Authorizations.

The Scope and Content Statement for the selection or development of the diversified liberal studies (DLS) examination was adopted in February, 1972, and the commons examination was adopted in May, 1972. In March, 1972, Senator Rodda, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, spoke to the Commission on the history and background of the diversified liberal studies major. He felt very strongly that DLS degree was the appropriate major for elementary teachers. In exchange for his support of Assembly Bill 122, he had insisted on two inclusions: (1) an alternative to the examination; and (2) the diversified liberal studies major for elementary teachers (6: March, 1972).

During the hearings on AB 122 in San Francisco, Senator Rodda had expressed strong feelings about the diversified liberal studies degree. He related that several years of effort had been made by the Legislature to persuade colleges to actually offer a diversified or liberal arts major. He noted bitterly that those effects went back at least to 1961, and he suggested that the college was deliberately obstructing the will of the Legislature. In response, representatives from several state colleges had pointed out that the Chancellor's Office would not approve the granting of a Bachelor's Degree based upon a diversified liberal studies major. It was also pointed out that the diversified major was not acceptable for admission to many graduate schools.

The Commission was also faced with the strong feeling that many IHE faculty members had questions or concerns regarding the development of new subject matter and professional preparation programs. However, higher education faculty reaction to the examination was even less enthusiastic than to subject matter programs and their wish was to provide their candidates with an avenue other than the examination.

At the April, 1973 meeting, the Commission had authorized the Examinations Committee to review the diversified liberal studies programs on the basis of the 84 semester-units that were to be equally distributed among the following four areas.

1. English, including grammar, literature, composition, and speech;
2. Mathematics and the physical or life sciences;
3. Social sciences, other than education and education methodology; and
4. Humanities and the fine arts including foreign languages.

In implementing the provisions of this section, the Commission may provide for a three semester-unit variance in any of the four areas required.

By June, 1973, 16 IHEs had submitted their DLS programs for review. By July, 1975, the DLS programs in 60 IHEs had been granted waiver status (9: 1974–75).

At the December, 1972 Commission meeting the recommendation of the Examinations Committee accepted the subject matter content of the single subject waiver programs conform to the Scope and Content Statement for the specified subject.

By November, 1973, the Commission had approved the SCSs for only seven single subjects. The Commission made special provisions for those single subject waiver programs in which a SCS was not yet adopted. As a temporary measure until the SCS were completed, the Commission granted a waiver to candidates holding any subject matter degree which the institution judged to be reasonable preparation to teach the subject in public schools of California (6: November, 1973).

In response to the interim waiver policy, colleges often submitted subject matter programs that were not new, but rather had been developed to meet the Fisher requirements. It was not unusual for an IHE to submit 10 to 15 degree programs and verify that each of these degree programs provided appropriate preparation for a specific single subject credential. An excerpt from the Commission's July, 1974 Minutes shows the submission of 15 degree programs verified by one IHE as providing appropriate preparation for the Social Science Single Subject Authorization (6: July, 1974).

Single Subject for		Degree Program	
Social Science	American Studies	Economics	Political Science
	Anthropology	Environmental Studies	Psychology
	Asian Studies	History	Sociology
	Child Development	Latin American Studies	Speech & Hearing
	Comparative	Philosophy	Urban Studies
	Cultures		

In response to a query from the Commission regarding the interim waiver policy, the Office of the Attorney General told the Commission that the statutes required the Commission to request additional information about each subject matter waiver program. This decision prompted the Commission, in March 1974, to adopt a policy for waiver programs (known as the Permanent Waiver Policy) that was to become effective after July 1, 1975. This policy required the colleges to secure the advice of a consultant group composed of public school teachers of the subject; to use the State Department of Education's curriculum framework, along with the Scope and Content Statement, to determine the appropriateness of the subject matter waiver program; and to assure a reasonable breadth of subject matter coverage within the relevant single subject category.

At the January, 1975 Commission meeting, Ex Officio Commissioner Dr. Gary Fenstermacher reported that among the faculty and representatives of the University of California, the matter of greatest consternation was the Commission's Permanent Waiver Policy.

There is a degree of conflict and disagreement among the Universities' various campuses and between academic departments. The permanent Waiver Policy does not seem to be detrimental, but does seem to set a precedent for other forms of intervention into the degree programs of the University. It would appear to be safe to assume that the University of California is responsive and sympathetic to the Commission's need to evaluate the activities of the program

of teacher preparation, but the technique to be used is questioned (6: January, 1975).

Following the July 1, 1975 operational date of the Permanent Waiver Policy, the review and approval of subject matter programs became more stringent. Staff was required to complete a multiple-criterion form in the review of each waiver program that became a part of the Examinations Committee's agenda each month.

In March, 1976, the Commission revised the Title 5 Regulations on waiver programs. The revision was directed to subject matter categories which included several distinct disciplines such as life science, physical science, social science, and English. The IHE was required to develop the program so that the candidate completing a major in one discipline (such as physics) would have to study in other disciplines within the category of physical science (chemistry, earth science) to the extent of at least half the study in the major discipline.

At the May, 1976 meeting, Ex Officio Commissioner Dr. Gary Fenstermacher raised the issue of IHEs granting equivalence to waiver programs when he stated:

Has the Commission adopted an official stance on the matter of equivalence to waiver programs? It seems that the Commission is slowly but surely legitimating the notion that institutions may certify academic preparation equivalent to an approved waiver program—despite a clear rejection of this procedure by the Planning and Evaluation Committee a few months ago. Of course, it has been necessary to provide for out-of-State students. Yet, could it not be that by providing equivalence for out-of-State candidates, we are placing California students at a disadvantage by requiring of them either examination or the exact waiver program as approved? (6: May 1976)

Dr. Fenstermacher went on to suggest that to require all candidates to take the examination who had not completed an approved waiver program would be a more fair and consistent practice.

By the end of the 1970s, the Commission had approved diversified liberal studies waiver programs in nearly all of the 70 IHEs with approved professional preparation programs. However, the approval of single subject waiver programs was quite another story. While 1,400 waiver programs had been approved under the very liberal interim waiver policy, only 531 single subject waiver programs were approved under the more stringent Permanent Waiver Policy. The “conflict and disagreement” reported by Ex Officio Commission Fenstermacher at the July, 1975 Commission meeting, was reflected in the small number of single subject waiver programs submitted by the nine campuses of the University of California, who averaged less than 5 single subject waiver programs per campus as compared to an average of 12 single subject waiver programs per campus for the California State University and College system (9: 1979–80).

In late 1979 and early 1980, the Commission staff did a study of 531 single subject waiver programs to determine the match between the detailed courses required for completion of the subject matter waiver program, and the courses commonly taught in the public schools. The major finding of that study was as follows:

While all waiver programs met the Title 5 Regulations and the Commission’s present (permanent) waiver policy, many had little match between the courses required for completion of a single subject waiver program and courses commonly taught in the public schools (Special Topics, May, 1980).

Great effort and time were expended by the Commissioners and Commission staff in setting standards and procedures for the development, review, and approval of waiver programs. In addition, many colleges made commendable efforts to develop waiver programs. However, the results were far from satisfactory for either the Commission, the IHEs, or for the teacher candidates.

The interim waiver policy, in effect prior to July 1, 1975, met the intent of the preamble of the Ryan Act: “Broad minimum standards . . . to encourage both high standards and diversity”

However, many of the 1,400 single subject waiver programs submitted and approved under the interim waiver policy seemed to some observers as an indictment of both the Commission and the IHEs that submitted them purporting to be “appropriate preparation for teaching the subject.”

Conversely, the 531 single subject waiver programs submitted and approved under the “complex, detailed, and prescriptive” Permanent Waiver Policy were found in the 1979-80 study to have little match with subjects commonly taught in the public schools.

The 1979-80 study of waiver programs did not include the diversified liberal studies waiver programs; such study would come in the mid-1980s. However, as a program consultant and as Chief of Programs during the years 1974-79, Dr. Mastain had an opportunity, as did other staff, to talk with candidates and graduates of the Multiple Subjects Credential Program, which for most included completion of the diversified liberal studies waiver program. These opportunities came when Commission staff were on 10 to 20 college campuses each year for the three- to four-day on-site evaluations (External Assessment). The most common complaints were that the diversified liberal studies waiver program was not cohesively planned and implemented, and that faculty assigned to teach the courses in DLS program were most often junior, non-tenured staff whose first priority was not the preparation of public school teachers.

Dr. Mastain believes that there are a number of lessons to be learned from the Commission’s efforts to set standards and procedures for the development and approval of subject matter waiver programs. Some of them include the following:

1. Study the issues very carefully before adopting policy. The interim policy and the Permanent Waiver Policy were changed a number of times, and even with the changes, the policies and procedures did not produce the hoped-for results. The continually changing waiver policies decreased the credibility of the Commission. The Commission was under a tight timeline to have the Ryan Act operational by September 15, 1994. The Commission was cognizant of the colleges’ concerns that they needed clear and accurate directions, now, about the transition from Fisher to Ryan that they could pass on to their candidates. In retrospect, the Commission might have adopted a policy that was

accepting of one or more Fisher degrees that were most closely aligned to one of the single subject categories, allowing the college to make that choice and verification. Such a policy would have allowed time for conferences and discussions to sort out the very great complexities involved in the development of subject matter waiver programs that would provide appropriate preparation for California public school teachers.

2. Recognize who the people are that must be involved if the policy is going to be implemented. A careful study of the issues would have made it clear that the development of subject matter programs without the full involvement and cooperation of the faculty of those subject matter fields would not be successful.

The Commission had been successful in involving college subject matter experts on every advisory panel in the development of the Scope and Content Statements. These experts could have also given advice on the best way to gain the support and cooperation of their subject matter colleagues in the designing and implementing of appropriate subject matter waiver programs. However, the interim waiver policy gave the do-anything-you-want message and the Permanent Waiver Policy was prescriptive to the point of damaging future communication with academic departments.

The complaint often heard from the faculty of academic departments was “The Commission is infringing on our academic freedom.” The complaints, often heard from the deans and faculty of the schools of education were, “The Commission should do on-site evaluations of subject matter programs similar to the Commission’s evaluations of the professional preparation programs.” There was much to be done in improving subject matter preparation for teachers and in finding ways to better balance or intermesh subject matter and pedagogy at the beginning of the 1980s. Perhaps the experiences and things learned in the 1970s would lead to significant strides in the 1980s.

BEGINNING TEACHER EVALUATION STUDY

The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) was one of the most significant educational research studies of the 1970s; both in terms of the quality of research, and the impact on in-service in teacher education. The BTES findings drove the NIE's staff development efforts for ten years and added much to the credibility of the NIE. --Virginia Richardson, Former Head of the Teaching and Teacher Education Division, National Institute of Education.

The genesis of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) was the Commission's responsibility to establish standards both for the issuance of credentials and for the approval of teacher education programs. The initial concerns were raised in the Committee on the Teaching of Reading, chaired by Commissioner Marcella Johnson, a reading specialist in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and in the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching, chaired by Stan Green. Executive Secretary George Gustafson contacted the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) regarding funds to determine those teacher competencies crucial to the teaching of reading to disadvantaged youth.

The OEO approved funds for the study. However, when the National Institute of Education (NIE) was established in 1972, as the Federal agency responsible for education research and development, funding for the project was moved to the NIE. Dr. Virginia Richardson, who was with the OEO at the time the original project was proposed and funded, joined the NIE in 1972, and was instrumental in the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study becoming one of the NIE's initial research projects. Dr. Richardson later became Head of NIE's Teaching and Teacher Education Division, and thereby the oversight officer of the BTES from the beginning to the final period of dissemination.

The BTES was initially planned to fulfill two purposes: the identification of generic teacher competencies, and the evaluation of teacher education programs through the follow-up evaluation of graduates of those programs. The intended focus on recent graduates of teacher

education programs was the basis for the name of the study--the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study.

The study was conducted in three phases. Phase I, 1972-73, was devoted to planning. The Commission developed a design for the research and held a conference where it was critiqued by prominent researchers, teacher educators, teachers, and administrators. From suggestions at the conference, the Commission revised the design to focus the research on grades two and five, and to consider the teaching of mathematics as well as reading. These two areas, reading and mathematics at grades two and five, remained the focus of the research throughout the study. The Commission also decided to follow a request-for-proposals (RFP) process to conduct the research, rather than establish its own research staff; to convene a research advisory board composed of leading researchers throughout the United States; and to hire a second contractor to conduct a program audit of the activities of each major research contractor (7: pp. 2-5).

During Phase II, 1973-74, researchers collected data from 97 teachers for five major areas of interest. These were student achievement, student background, school characteristics and climate, teacher background, and teaching behavior. During Phase III, between 1974 and 1977, the Far West Laboratory analyzed the findings and extended the research to concentrate on a small sample of teachers. This research concentrated on classroom climate, teacher planning, instructional decision-making, consistency and appropriateness of teaching behaviors, how instruction time was used, and student engagement in instructional time.

The findings of the BTES are summarized by Fisher, Berliner, and their colleagues at Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in Chapter 1 of the Commission's publication, *Time to Learn*. They describe fourteen major findings from the study and organize them into two groups: the first set of findings reports relationships between academic learning time and student achievement; the second set covers teaching processes and classroom environment in relationship to student learning (7: pp. 15-29).

In March, 1978, the Commission held a seminar on the progress of the BTES. Dr. David Berliner, former director of the BTES at Far West Laboratory; Dr. Charles Fisher, current

Director of the BTES Project at Far West Laboratory; and Dr. Robert Bush from Stanford University and member of the Research Advisory Board, discussed the findings and implications of the study. The researchers pointed out that two of the goals of the BTES were to: (1) explore the quality of research on teaching and learning; and (2) influence and improve the quality of teacher preparation in California. They stated that the Commission had been instrumental in supporting quality research through the process of the BTES, and they listed articles and papers that discussed and lauded the findings and implications of the BTES (6: March, 1978).

In regard to influencing and improving the quality of teacher preparation in California, the researchers stated that the BTES ought to be taken seriously by teacher education programs. However, the researchers cautioned that although the knowledge gained from the project would help California take a leadership role in improving teacher training programs, it should not be used to develop and shape policy. In reflecting on the way teachers learn, they felt that eventually beginning teachers should begin their careers with a credential that limited them to grades and subjects. After gaining substantial experience and following additional training, teachers could earn a more comprehensive credential that would allow them to undertake a wider range of teaching responsibilities (2: p. 288).

The staff coordinator of the BTES from the beginning, Dr. Marjorie Powell, satisfied with her efforts from 1972 through early 1978, left the Commission to join the research division of the California State Department of Education. The Commission then hired Dr. Ann Lieberman, Associate Director of the Horace-Mann-Lincoln Institute and Associate Professor with the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers' College, Columbia University, to coordinate the final two years of NIE support for the Dissemination of Research Phase (6: August, 1978).

In 1976, the Commission had convened a Research Utilization Board composed of school personnel, teacher educators, and researchers. Based on their recommendations, the Commission developed a dissemination plan for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years. In August, 1978, the Commission reconstituted the Research Utilization Board to assist and advise in the two-year dissemination effort.

The dissemination efforts of the Commission during the first years of the study included the BTES Report, providing extensive summaries of the various technical reports, and the BTES Newsletter, designed to summarize research results with a range of audiences. In addition, staff members of the Commission, ETS, and Far West Laboratory made presentations at California and national professional meetings (7: p.5).

In 1978-79, the Commission solicited preparation of twelve professional papers on the findings and implications of the BTES research. Each paper was prepared by a researcher or educational practitioner familiar with the BTES research, and the information provided in these papers had been used as the basis for meetings with educational constituencies throughout California, and for publication in abstract form in four BTES Newsletters.

In addition to meetings with educational constituencies throughout the state, seven regional conferences were held in the Spring of 1979 to discuss BTES findings and implications within the educational community of California. The BTES Newsletters, research publications prepared during the earlier years of research, and other information were widely distributed.

The Commission also announced a grants competition through which small grants of no more than \$5,000 each were awarded to teachers and other educational practitioners during the 1979-80 year. The purpose was to assist in the utilization of findings from the BTES research in educational settings. These grants were the primary focus of the second year of the Utilization of Research Phase of BTES (9: 1978-79).

During the 1979-80 year, the Commission sponsored sixteen small grants to local schools, practitioners, and institutions of higher education. In each case, the grants were for implementation of classroom-based activities utilizing findings from the Study. In addition, the Commission published several BTES Newsletters and the book, *Time to Learn*, which contains articles on the findings and implications of the multi-year research project (9: 1979-80).

The dissemination efforts by the Commission were enhanced by publications such as the 1979 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), entitled *Classroom Management*. This 1979 Yearbook was prepared by a special Committee on Classroom Management which included among its membership Ann Lieberman and Gary Fenstermacher, formerly the University of California representative on the Commission. The NSSE Yearbook contained twelve references to the BTES, with information quoted from BTES reports authored by David Berliner, Patricia Elias, Charles Fisher, Carolyn Hartsough, Nadine Lambert, Fred McDonald, Ray Rist, Barak Rosenshine, and William Tikunoff (6: April, 1979).

The BTES gained national, even worldwide, attention and credibility. The study had accomplished more than was ever hoped for in 1972. The study had:

- Created a new climate of confidence that teachers could make a significant difference in student learning. This repudiated findings of Coleman's 1966 study that teachers had little influence on student learning;
- Identified skills and practices that teachers needed to understand and utilize in order to maximize student learning;
- Established the importance of the Commission's work and bolstered their sense of worth; and
- Advanced professionalization by documenting the importance of the teacher.

The BTES provided Commissioners and staff with the conceptual seeds that would form the basis for the legislative reform package of the 1980s.

The Committee of Credentials

The Ryan Act required the Commission to appoint a Committee of Credentials, consisting of two elementary public school teachers, two secondary public school teachers, one public school administrator, one present member of the governing board of a public school district, and one representative of the public. The Committee of Credentials was, under the direct supervision of the Commission, responsible for the granting, issuance, suspension, and revocation of credentials.

The concept of the Committee of Credentials was not unique to the Ryan Act. Such a committee had been in operation within the State Department of Education for many years. The staff of the Legislature's Sub-Committee on School Personnel and Teacher Qualifications had attended a series of Committee of Credentials meetings in 1966. The publication of the Sub-Committee, *The Restoration of Teaching*, documents the abuses of Assistant Superintendent Everett Calvert and other officials in their failure to follow basic principles of due process. As a result of the report of such abuses, Assemblymember Leo Ryan successfully carried legislation in 1967 creating a Committee of Credentials with a very different composition, that included four public school teachers, one public school administrator, one school board member, one lay person, one member appointed by the Department of Education, and the Superintendent of Instruction. Ryan's legislation also specified recognized due process legal procedures which the newly constituted Committee of Credentials was to follow (Statutes 1967, Chapter 1694)(12: p. 123).

In addition to Ryan's legislation regarding the composition and function of the Committee of Credentials, the Legislative Analyst's office recommended in 1966 that the investigations office of the Bureau of Credentials be abolished. Following the Analyst's recommendations, all of the personnel and the duties of the Investigations Office were transferred from the Department of Education to the California Office of Criminal Identification and Investigation (12: p. 124).

At the July, 1971 Commission meeting, Richard Shipp, Executive Secretary to the State Department's Committee of Credentials, presented an overview of the workload and procedures

of the Committee of Credentials (6: July, 1971). The Commission was further alerted to the functioning of the Committee of Credentials as they heard presentations from Richard Anthony, legal counsel for the California Teachers Association, and Lawrence Karleton, a Sacramento attorney who had represented many clients before the Committee of Credentials (6: July, 1971).

Following the presentations by Shipp, Anthony, and Karleton, the Commission Chairman appointed a committee to consider the options presented and to recommend procedures to the Commission for the operation of the Committee of Credentials.

The Committee was chaired by Commissioner Mrs. E. L. (Mike) Evans, and included Commissioner Barbara Anderson, who had served on the Committee of Credentials in 1970. Mrs. Anderson was fully aware of the background of the 1967 Ryan legislation, of the political sensitivity of the cases that would come before the Commission's Committee of Credentials, and of the need to develop very clear lines of authority and communication between the Commission and the Committee of Credentials.

The Committee of Credentials presented recommendations to the Commission at the September, 1971 meeting, which included a chart illustrating the flow of administrative decisions and list of detailed administrative procedures to be followed by the Committee of Credentials. Following discussion, the Commission adopted the recommendations of the committee (6: 1971).

The Commission's Standing Committee on the Identification of Personnel Resources was responsible for gathering nominations and proposing members for the Committee of Credentials. At the October, 1971 meeting, the Committee recommended seven individuals to serve on the Committee on Credentials, and the Commissioners accepted this recommendation. The newly named Committee of Credentials met for the first time at the December, 1971 meeting of the Commission. Richard Shipp introduced the members of the Commission's first Committee of Credentials:

Mrs. Dorothy H. Gibson	School Board Member
Mrs. Marian Mosley	Elementary School Teacher

Mrs. Jane Salera	Public Member
Mr. Laurence A. Scott	School Administrator
Mrs. Janice B. Stewart	Elementary School Teacher
Dr. Albert Weissberg	Secondary School Teacher
Mr. Fenton Williams, Jr.	Secondary School Teacher

Three members of the Commission's Committee of Credentials--Gibson, Scott, and Williams—had previously served on the Department of Education's Committee of Credentials. These appointments helped to ensure a smooth transition from the “old” to the “new” Committee of Credentials.

Throughout the 1970s, the Commission appointed one of its members to serve as liaison to the Committee of Credentials. The first appointee, Commissioner Mrs. E. L. Evans, was followed by Commissioner Mary Ann Stewart, Dorothy Gibson, and Marcella Johnson.

In October, 1972, the Commission established additional guidelines for the Committee of Credentials based on the heavy workload encountered during the first ten months of the Committee's operation. The focus of the guidelines was for the Executive Secretary to give the Committee of Credentials the authority to have staff take care of a multitude of minor complaints.

During the 1972-73 fiscal year, the Committee of Credentials took actions on 730 cases. The specific disposition of these cases was as follows:

Granted Application	524
Denied Application	53
Suspended Credential	43
Revoked Credential	94
Further Investigation	<u>16</u>
TOTAL	730

In addition, the Executive Secretary to the Committee of Credentials issued a considerable number of private reprimands for offenses that were within the Committee of Credentials' and the Commission's guidelines for such actions by the staff.

However, problems were brewing during 1972 among members of the Committee of Credentials. In January and February, the Commission received letters of resignation from Gibson, Scott, and Williams, the three members who had previously served on the Department of Education's Committee of Credentials. The story broke in the Hayward, California *Review* on March 21, 1973, and was soon picked up by other newspapers. The reasons for the resignations were explained in the newspaper article, which followed a three column heading entitled "Permissiveness at the Teacher Level." The first two paragraphs of the article are quoted below.

During the past several months, three members of the California Committee on Teacher Credentials have quit in protest.

Each of the three believes that the Committee's four-member teacher majority has displayed a consistent and improper pattern of permissiveness. This permissiveness, they charge, has resulted in allowing known sex offenders, and others guilty of unprofessional conduct, to continue teaching in California's public schools (Hayward Review, March 21, 1973).

The Commission appointed Mrs. Olga Gutierrez to replace Fenton Williams, and Rod McClain to replace Laurence Scott. Mrs. Gibson stayed on until April, 1974, when she became a member of the Commission.

The Commission increased the supervision of the Committee of Credentials by having Commission members attend the full three-day work session of the Committee of Credentials. In addition, the Commission reviewed the actions taken by the Committee of Credentials with increased care. The lesson learned from this incident influenced the work of the Committee and the oversight by the Commission throughout the 1970s.

During the years of 1972-73 through 1978-79, the Commission received an average of 4,200 complaints each year. These complaints came from a variety of sources, including the Department of Justice, police departments, school districts, parents, and the public. Many of the complaints were handled by staff to the Committee of Credentials under the guidelines developed by the Committee and approved by the Commission. During the years 1972-73 through 1978-79, the Committee of Credentials handled an average of 665 cases each year. During that same period of time, the Commission took action to accept or reject a hearing officer's decision on an average of 81 cases each year (9: 1972-79).

A major reason for the large number of cases that are reviewed by the Committee of Credentials and Commission staff was the fingerprint that was required with each application for a credential. Instituted in 1951, California was one of two states that required a fingerprint of credential applicants during the 1970s. Also in California, police departments are required by statutes to report the arrests of public school educators to the Department of Justice, which in turn is required to notify the Commission of said arrests.

On the recommendation of the Committee of Credentials and at the request of the Commission, in early 1974, the General Services Management Office did a study of the operations of the Professional Standards Unit. At the December, 1974 Commission meeting, the management analyst assigned to the study, Michael J. Dillon, presented the final report of the study. He concluded his presentation with this summary:

It is apparent that the Committee of Credentials has been preparing and processing cases in the best management procedures, and that there is a need for additional staffing in order to reduce the backlog (6: December, 1974).

On the basis of the study, the Commission authorized the unit to add staff to assist with the heavy workload.

The Committee of Credentials' discipline cases fall into two general categories:

- Mandatory denials or revocations based upon the statutory presumption that persons convicted of certain specified offenses are unfit to hold credentials, and in which no fitness hearing is required. Under a court decision of 1966, a certificate of rehabilitation under Penal Code (PC) 4852.01 or a termination of probation and dismissal of the information or accusation under PC 1203.4 will entitle such a person to a hearing of his/her fitness to teach notwithstanding the earlier conviction. Except in such cases, the Commission had no discretion but to deny or revoke the credential. These mandatory cases go directly to the Commission as part of its monthly agenda.
- In the second category of cases, the Commission performs an investigatory function through its Committee of Credentials to determine whether probable cause exists which justifies disciplinary action. This category of cases includes failure to fulfill contracts of employment; immoral or unprofessional conduct; a persistent defiance of, and refusal to obey the laws regulating service in the public school system; arrest for and/or conviction of non-mandatory criminal offenses; or for any cause which would have warranted denial of an application for a credential or its renewal.

The actions of the Committee of Credentials could take included granting or denying the application, revoking or suspending the credential, issuing a public or private reprimand, or closing the case. If the decision was to revoke or suspend the credential, based on the investigation and the hearing before the Committee of Credentials, the defendant could either accept the decision or request a hearing before the Department of Justice Hearing Officer. The decision of the Hearing Officer then came to the Commission for acceptance or rejection. If the Commission rejected the Hearing Officer's decision, the Commission was obligated by statute to investigate and hear the case from beginning to end.

The table below shows the actions taken by the Committee of Credentials and the actions taken by the Commission during the seven year period of fiscal year 1972-73 through fiscal year 1978-79.

Table 1

**Disposition of Discipline Cases
(June 1972 through June 1979)**

Fiscal Year	Granted CofC Comm		Denied CofC* Comm**		Suspended CofC* Comm**		Revoked CofC* Comm**		Further Investigation	Closed
1972-73	512	12	51	2	37	6	49	45	16	
1973-74	279	8	66	1	32	9	36	27	96	142
1974-75	310	4	143	5	29	10	73	54	121	178
1975-76	162	7	43	6	13	19	50	47	171	229
1976-77	103	16	21	6	15	8	21	64		229
1977-78	148	16	15	5	22	19	11	61		262
1978-79	119	8	26	2	53	21	37	57		352
Totals	1,633	71	365	27	201	92	277	355	404	1,392

- The Committee of Credentials' recommendations for denial, suspensions, or revocations were sent to the Commission for information, and for the Commission's action as required by statute.
- These suspensions and revocations were in addition to the Committee of Credentials' recommended suspensions and revocations (9: 1978-79).

The Commission was ever watchful of the work of the Committee of Credentials. Each month the recommendations of the Committee of Credentials were reviewed by the Commission. If it disagreed with a decision, the case was returned to the Committee. If it disagreed with a number of recommendations, the Commission would meet with the full Committee to discuss their differing perceptions. These meetings often resulted in changes in the guidelines or changes in the Title 5 Regulations. The Commissioners who served as liaison to the Committee of Credentials were responsible for an effective two-way flow of communication between the two bodies.

In November, 1977, the Commission adopted a set of guidelines that had been developed by the Committee of Credentials. The guidelines were very specific in detailing the type of cases that could be cleared by the staff analyst, and required the Chief of Professional Standards (formerly titled the Executive Secretary to the Committee of Credentials) to be consulted when questions arose. These guidelines also specified the type of cases that the Chief could clear, and the situations in which the case must be sent to the Committee of Credentials.

In February, 1978, state Senator John Stull sent a letter to the Commission, district superintendents, teacher organizations, school boards, and others announcing a special subcommittee hearing on the topic, “Teacher Dismissals and Credential Revocations—Why so Few?” The letter reminded the reader of the intent of the Stull Act of 1972, mandating regular evaluation of credentialed employees, and of Senate Bill 969 (Rodda), also of 1972, that established procedures for dismissal of credentialed employees. The letter went on to explain that the Ryan Act charged the CTPL with the responsibility of revoking credentials “in order to ensure that our students are not being taught unprofessionally by those physically or morally unfit for the task” (6: April, 1978).

Stull’s letter stated that background data for his and Senator Rodda’s concerns included dismissal and credential statistics going back five years for the teaching profession, and current data for discipline imposed on members of fifteen other professions. On the basis of this data, Stull concludes that the odds an active teacher would suffer disciplinary action were 1 in 4,500, while for doctors and lawyers it was about 1 in 600.

This type of discipline is five to ten times less common for teachers than for almost every other profession we checked; only cosmetologists come close, with odds of 1 in 3,200 while the median is about 1 in 600 (6: April, 1978).

The legislative subcommittee meeting was held on March 10, 1978, with a stated purpose “to ascertain why formal discipline appears to be relatively lax in the teaching profession.” The

Commission was asked to respond to a set of specific questions contained in an addendum to the letter from Senator Stull.

Executive Secretary Peter LoPresti made the presentation to the subcommittee on March 10, 1978. He made clear that the responsibility for determination of competency as a condition for continued employment was made by the school district through a locally convened Commission on Professional Competence. He explained that the CTPL was not a part of this process and that present statutes did not require notice to the Commission of adverse actions based on incompetence. Dr. LoPresti gave a lengthy explanation of the procedures followed by the Commission and the Committee of Credentials, including the fingerprint requirement and its uniqueness to California. He concluded with a presentation of data on disciplinary action taken for the years June 30, 1974, through June 30, 1977. This data showed the Commission and the Committee of Credentials to have taken 627 actions to deny, suspend, or revoke during the three-year period for a yearly average of 209 actions. Dr. LoPresti also pointed out that in cases where the Committee does not vote to grant, deny, suspend, or revoke, the Committee often sends a letter of reprimand as part of the process to close the case. In addition, the staff of the CTPL was authorized to send letters of private admonition. In the 1976-77 fiscal year, approximately 1,700 letters of admonition were sent to credential holders (6: April, 1978).

Shortly after the subcommittee hearings, the Commission added a stipulation to the Title 5 regulations requiring the governing board of a school district to send to the CTPL a transcript of the findings and conclusions of the Commission on Professional Competence together with any evidentiary material, including investigative reports, on which such recommendations were based (6: June, 1978).

At the August/September 1978 meeting of the Commission, the Licensing Committee was directed to review the work of the Committee of Credentials and “return with details concerning the Licensing Committee doing a quarterly review of what the Committee of Credentials is doing, including how cases have been processed, actions taken on various kinds of cases by the Committee and administratively” (6: August 31, September 1, 1978).

In 1978, the State experienced a movement to give all California regulatory commission's greater public representation. Legislation effective January 1, 1979, was passed to increase the number of public members of the Committee of Credentials from one to three, while the number of teachers was reduced from four to two. The total number of members remained at seven, including one school board member and one school administrator.

At the March, 1979 Commission meeting, Commissioner Robert Salley told his colleagues that legislators feel the Commission is too lenient regarding revocations, suspensions, or denials of credentials. It was suggested that more information be provided in the Annual Report regarding the breakdown of the different types of cases, and the actions taken after the careful consideration given each case by the Committee of Credentials. At the same meeting, the Commission discussed the need to clarify the differences between the issue of incompetent teachers as dealt with by the local commissions on teacher competence and the issues of criminal actions taken by the Commission.

Two situations in 1979 produced considerable newspaper publicity regarding the responsibilities and function of the Commission and the Committee of Credentials. One situation involved a teacher walk-out in the South San Francisco Unified School District in which the San Mateo County District Attorney requested the CTPL to investigate the charges of the South San Francisco School District against each of the teachers involved in the walk-out. Upon refusal of the CTPL to investigate the charges, the San Mateo District Attorney requested and received a writ of mandate from the Superior Court of San Mateo County. The writ of mandate required a hearing by the San Mateo County Board of Education and a report of its findings and recommendations to the Commission. The conflict between the CTPL and the San Mateo County District Attorney's office produced considerable newspaper coverage.

The second situation involved the revocation of a teacher's credential based on sexual misconduct with a minor. The follow-up letter to the teacher from a CTPL staff member announcing the revocation action included a paragraph that was judged sympathetic to the teacher who in turn released the letter to the newspaper and used the letter in a one-million dollar lawsuit (unsuccessful) against his former school district's governing board.

These two situations had the following repercussions:

- the reassignment of the Chief of Professional Standards;
- the designation of the CTPL's Licensing Committee as responsible to establish close observation and scrutinize the practices of the Committee of Credentials;
- revisions in the Title 5 regulations;
- an updated set of policies and procedures for the close monitoring of the Committee of Credentials;
- supplementary budget language calling for a review of the professional standards procedures and a report of proposed changes, due December 1, 1979, to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee;
- six pieces of CTPL-sponsored legislation for 1980; and
- several bills being proposed for 1980 by members of the Legislature.

While national data on the discipline of credential holders was not available for the 1970s, data from the 1988 edition of the *Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States* (a publication of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification) shows that more than 60% of all disciplinary actions of credential holders throughout the United States took place in the only three states with a fingerprint requirement for initial certification. During the 1970s, only two states, California and Nevada, had a fingerprint requirement. However, the fingerprinting evidence from California convinced the State of Florida to pass legislation for fingerprinting. The staff of the Florida Department of Education report significant differences in disciplinary actions taken before and after the fingerprint requirement went into effect (14: p. C-14).

Each year the Commission listened to the advice of legislators; read and learned from proposed legislation related to the work of the Committee of Credentials; discussed the recommendations for changes from the Committee of Credentials and staff; and heard from the cadre of lawyers who frequently represented defendants before the Committee. On the basis of these efforts, the Commission improved and refined the regulations and procedures related to the work of the Committee of Credentials.

THE ISSUANCE OF CREDENTIALS

One of the major functions of the Commission is the issuance of teaching and service credentials to applicants recommended by a California college with a Commission approved program, and to those applicants who are found qualified upon direct application to the Commission. In 1971 there were 70 staff members responsible for this function. The fee of \$20 collected with each application was, by statute, deposited into the Teacher Credential Fund and served as the sole support for the activities of the Commission.

The 70 members of the licensing staff, transfers from the State Department's Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification, were ready to begin work in their new quarters at 1020 "O" Street in August, 1971. However, two matters demanded immediate attention: (1) the Commission was faced with a three- to four-month application "backlog," which meant 90 to 120 working days from the time the application was received to the issuance of the credential; and (2) the processing costs were exceeding the \$20 fee. Major steps were taken to speed up the process and reduce costs, including contracting with the Department of General Services to microfilm over 300,000 files representing 3,500,000 microfilm exposures.

A second major step was discontinuation of the computer, a return to manual processing of all applications, and insistence upon a complete application (all incomplete applications were returned rather than being placed in limbo pending receipt of the missing information). The results of these actions are stated in a 1973 study of the licensing operations by the Department of Finance:

Management determined that a 10-day turn-around time in processing an application was a goal to be achieved. This time period contrasts to actual procession time of about 90 days during the latter days under the Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification. During the review, it was determined that the turn-around time was 10-15 days for the majority of applications (18: pp. 5-6).

The functions of the licensing branch were carried out by staff in four units, which included: Certification Officers; Storage and Retrieval; Microfilm; and Information Services.

The statistical data shown in Table 2 is one indication of the Licensing Branch's workload. However, the problem of issuing credentials under pre-Fisher and Fisher Statutes, while preparing to issue credentials under Ryan Act Statutes, added considerably to the workload. In addition, the differences between the credential structure (titles, requirements, and authorization of credentials) of Fisher and Ryan were great, and this also added to the workload. Finally, the Commission's attempt to severely limit direct application in favor of college recommendations took a serious toll on the time and energy of the licensing staff.

Table 2
Licensing: Comparative Workload Data
(1971-72 through 1977-78)

	1971-71	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
Total Mail Received	242,685	199,681	202,945	263,066	204,070	228,989	200,5209
Applications Received (fee mail)	112,955	109,944	110,952	122,704	122,142	137,761	118,238
Total Credentials Issued	133,219	115,526	98,445	120,219	106,735	141,263	134,686
Personal Interviews	7,199	10,336	11,070	11,150	9,177	10,756	10,517
Correspondence Mailed	90,162	43,371	27,389	19,350	29,005	24,686	23,379
Incoming Calls	40,081	41,749	43,647	46,182	45,234	60,233	68,666

In mid-1974, the Department of Finance completed a review of the Commission's activities, which included the following statement regarding operation of the Licensing Branch.

Another major consideration in establishing the Commission was to expedite the processing of credential applications. When the licensing function was located in the Department of Education, the average time required to process a credential was in excess of 90 days. Under the administration of the Commission, the time required to process a license has been reduced to between 25 and 30 days. One must conclude that in the licensing area the Commission has also lived up to the expectation of the Legislature (16: p. 38).

The commendation from the Department of Finance was most welcomed by the Commission. However, the constricted time frame, the differences in the Fisher and Ryan Credential structures, and the effort to severely limit direct application would produce criticism.

In 1973, a journal article by Dr. Sid Inglis at CSU, Sacramento who joined the staff of the Commission in 1974, reported the following in response to a survey of academic and teacher educators:

A third problem was obtaining prompt, incisive, and reliable answers from the Commission. This was particularly difficult for colleges that were attempting to assist students in the planning of their programs. Time and again the students have stated on campus after campus, “no one seems to know anything.” While exaggerated, this comment illustrates the frustrations felt by many during 1972–73, the critical year of transition. . . after their experiences with the Fisher Act, many felt that the lack of decisive answers would delay the implementation of the Ryan Act many years into the future (10: p. 7).

The Transition Time Frame

The Ryan Statutes stipulated that the “Act shall become operative on January 1, 1973, or at such earlier date as the Commission . . . may determine” (Chapter 557 of 1970). The Commission had asked for and secured an extension. However, to avoid confusion, the Commission took formal

action in January, 1973, to make operative the entire Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 (6: January 1973).

A second crucial statutory date was September 15, 1974. No credential, based on the rules and regulations in effect on December 31, 1971, was to be issued after this date. In addition, candidates for a Fisher Authorization were to meet requirements, or partial fulfillment, for the Clear Credential by September 15, 1974. When the Commission realized that the September 15, 1974, date was not realizable, they sought and secured legislation to change the date to September 15, 1976.

The rush to implement the Ryan Act by January, 1973; the need to change the date from September, 1974, to September 1976; and the lack of availability of some examinations and some approved programs did cause anxiety and confusion. In order to counter as much of this anxiety and confusion as possible, the Commission approved existing Fisher programs to September, 1976, and instituted a “lock list.” The lock list was a listing of candidates that the IHEs verified were or would be eligible for a Fisher Credential.

The operative term during the entire transition periods was “No one shall be adversely affected.” The Commission adopted appeal procedures and issued frequent communiqués to the field to guard against any student pursuing a credential being adversely affected. In addition, the Commission issued two documents, one listing information related to Fisher Credentials, and the other information related to Ryan Credentials. In April, 1973, the Student CTA Chapter developed an “Advisory Handbook for Students” and distributed it throughout the State.

The Credential Structure: Requirements, Titles and Authorizations

The differences in the titles, the requirements, and the authorization of Credentials within the Fisher Credential structure and the Ryan Credential structure were a factor in the level of difficulty in implementing the new credential structure.

There were some instances in which the title, requirements, and authorization of a Fisher Credential were very close (matched) to the title, requirements, and authorization of a Ryan Credential. Some examples included the Pupil Personnel Services Authorization, the School Nurse Services Authorization, and the Designated Subjects Teaching Authorization in Vocational and Technical Education.

The Fisher Standard Elementary Authorization and the Ryan Multiple Subjects Authorization have some similarity in requirements and authorization. However, the Standard Elementary Authorization limited its holder to teach at the elementary school, whereas the (Ryan) Multiple Subject Credential authorized levels kindergarten through grade 12 and adult (in a “self-contained” classroom).

The three components in which there was the greatest disparity between the two credential structures included the authorizations to teach subjects in a departmentalized setting; the authorization for teaching students with handicapping conditions; and the authorization for service as a school administrator.

The authorization to teach subjects in a departmentalized setting at one time followed any of following three patterns:

- the state issues a Secondary Teaching Credential which authorizes the holder to teach any subject (the pre-Fisher General Secondary Teaching Credential);
- the state issues a Secondary Teaching Credential which authorizes the holder to teach a very specific subject, such as speech (the Fisher Standard Secondary Teaching Credential); or

- the state issues a Secondary Teaching Credential in a broad subject category, such as English, which authorizes the holder to teach anything subsumed within that category, such as composition, literature, speech, creative writing, drama, forensics, humanities, language arts, theater arts, journalism, and debate (the Ryan Single Subject Teaching Credential).

The Ryan Act originally provided for eleven single subject “umbrella categories.” History, government, and agriculture were added by statutes, and physical and natural science were split into two authorizations, bringing the total to 15 single subject categories by 1974. The Commission was continually bombarded with requests to add additional single subject authorizations, including health, dance, and religion. The Commission spent considerable time considering requests for additional single subject authorizations. In May, 1976, the Commission adopted a policy to evaluate requests to add a single subject authorization which included criteria for scholarship, support, and breadth. Following adoption of the policy, the only request came from proponents for a single subject authorization in health. The authorization to teach health was subsumed within both the physical education and the life science single subjects. The staff did a review of physical education and life science subject matter waiver programs to determine the degree to which health science or health education was included within those programs. On the basis of staff’s finding that very little health education coursework within the approved subject matter programs for physical education or life science, the Commission did not oppose legislation and health was added as a single subject.

As a compromise between the broad authorization of the General Secondary and the very specific authorization of the Fisher Standard Secondary Authorization, the “umbrella” concept of the single subject also produced problems. In April, 1975, the California Educational Placement Association expressed concerns about the restrictiveness of the single subject authorization. In September 1977, a number of school districts would not accept applications from individuals holding single subject authorizations in such subjects as history. In late 1979, the Commission did a study to compare the assignment flexibility of Fisher Standard Secondary Authorizations versus the Ryan Single Subject Authorization. Personnel administrators claimed that the Fisher Standard Secondary Authorization provided more assignment flexibility. What the study found

was that the holder of a Fisher Standard Secondary authorizing the teaching of speech, for example, became a part of the English department and, in time, was assigned to teach any subject within the English department, even though it was not legal. The Commission previously had requested and received a legal opinion from the Attorney General stating, “The Commission is not empowered to promulgate rules which define and limit the assignment of teachers by governing boards” (CTPL Coded Correspondence 78–7910, September, 1978).

The discrepancies between the pre-Fisher and Fisher Authorizations and the Ryan Authorizations to teach children with handicapping conditions were very great. There were 28 Special Education Teaching Authorizations issued under prior statutes. There were five Ryan Special Education Teaching Authorizations and one Ryan Services Credential with a teaching authorization. All of the Ryan Special Education Teaching Authorizations required, as a prerequisite, a basic (elementary/secondary) teaching credential, whereas the Fisher Restricted Special Education Teaching Authorization did not require a basic teaching credential. There were other differences that made it difficult, if not impossible, to “match” a Fisher Special Education Authorization with a Ryan Special Education Authorization. The task of making sense out of the discrepancies and of clarifying the authorizations of all special education authorizations fell to the Licensing Branch.

The discrepancies between the Fisher and Ryan Authorizations to serve as school administrators were also considerable, although not nearly as troublesome as the Single Subject or Special Education Authorizations. The Ryan statutes provided for a single credential, issued on the completion of a Commission approved program, and authorizing service in *any* administrative position. Fisher statutes provided for two credentials, a standard supervision, and a standard administration. The Standard Supervision Credential required six years of college, five years of teaching experience, and authorized the holder to serve as a supervisor at those levels and subjects authorized on his/her teaching authorization (that is, elementary, secondary, or both, if the basic credentials were held). The holder could serve as a school principal with a major in an academic subject matter. The Standard Administration Credential required seven years of college and authorized the holder to serve in any administrative position.

The lack of “match” between the Ryan Credential structure and prior credential structures required effective and frequent in-service to licensing staff to ensure that the information disseminated to the field was accurate and consistent.

The credential structure was continually expanding to accommodate new authorizations, by statute or regulation, such as the Bilingual Certificate of Competence in 1975; the special education mainstreaming requirement for teachers and administrators of 1977; the visually handicapped authorization in 1979; and the adapted physical education authorization in 1979. All of these changes required new regulations, staff inservice, and dissemination to the field.

College “Recommend” versus Direct Application

The approved program concept, as envisioned by Ryan and Doyle, was that the Commission would approve professional preparation programs on the basis of a paper (staff) review, and an evaluation by an on-site team. When a candidate completed the approved program, he/she would be recommended by the college, thus eliminating or at least limiting the review of transcripts submitted on direct application to the Commission. The Commission supported the concept and made serious efforts during the 1970s to minimize direct applications.

However, there were just too many exceptions in which direct application was necessary to ensure that no one was adversely affected in the transition. The exceptions included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Candidates to whom the Commission had made a commitment;
- Candidates who completed requirements for a Fisher Credential before 9/15/74;
- Applicants who had completed three years of teaching in the last ten years, on the basis of a full professional credential;
- The renewal of pre-Ryan Credentials issued on the basis of partial fulfillment or postponement;
- Candidates who, for various reasons, could not secure a college recommendation;
- Applicants for Emergency Credentials; and

- Applicants for a Special Education Credential authorizing the teaching of educationally handicapped students when based on holding a valid teaching authorization, and verifying one year's experience teaching educationally handicapped children.

In addition to the exceptions cited above, there were two statutory changes that produced a multitude of direct applications. The Gualco Bill (Chapter 919 of the Statutes of 1975) enabled applicants to make direct application up to September 15, 1977, for all Specialist Instruction Credentials, other than the Special Education Specialist Instruction Credentials, authorized teaching in programs for communicatively handicapped and physically handicapped students. The direct application required verification of 24 semester-units, beyond the Baccalaureate Degree, in specified categories of skills and knowledge. Six of the 24 semester-units could be earned on the basis of verified experience. The Commission issued thousands of these credentials on direct application. Later legislation enabled applicants for the Learning and Severely Handicapped Credentials and the Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist Credential to apply directly to the Commission until September 15, 1980.

The second statute was the Dixon Bill (Statutes of 1978) which enabled holders of a Single Subject Teaching Credential to add one or more subsumed subjects on the basis of 20 semester-hours or 10 semester-hours of upper division coursework in a specific subject subsumed under one of the fifteen single subjects. In some cases the college verified the coursework and recommended for the added authorization. In most cases, however, the applicant applied directly to the Commission.

In November, 1976, staff reported to the Commission that during the period July 1, 1975, through April 30, 1976, the Licensing Branch had issued 25,000 initial issuance teaching credentials on direct application; and during the same period 16,000 teaching and service credentials were issued on the basis of institutional recommendation.

In January, 1977, Ex Officio Commissioner Fenstermacher asked the Commission to reconsider the present policy on direct applications and institute the following:

1. Establish an open and unrestricted policy for direct application;

2. Set the fee for direct application higher than the fee charged for a college– recommended application; and
3. Designate on the credential document: direct application or college recommend.

The Commission did not adopt Dr. Fenstermacher’s recommendations one and three. However, it did adopt a policy that any direct applications to reissue lapsed credentials, received after January 1, 1978, would be subject to a fee penalty.

Turn–Around Time and Staffing

The time it takes from the receipt of an application to the issuance of a credential (turn–around time) averaged less than 35 days during the 1970s. In the 1974–75 fiscal year, the Licensing Branch processed 120,000 applications with a staff of 64. In comparison, the Department of Education’s Bureau of Teacher Education and Licensing processed 133,000 applications in 1969 with a staff of 117 people (6: January 1975). The average turnaround time for 1976-77 was 42 working days, while the average turnaround time for 1977-78 was 18 working days.

COMMISSIONERS, STAFF, AND OBSERVERS

Commissioners

All Commissioners, except ex officio members, are appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the California State Senate. Forty-five (45) individuals served as Commission voting members, and 17 individuals served as ex officio Commission members during the period 1971 through 1979. The composition remained the same from the beginning through December 31, 1977. A bill by Assemblymember Teresa Hughes (formerly a Commission staff member) was passed in 1977 to add an ex officio representative from the Board of Governors of the California private colleges. In 1978, following a movement to give all California regulatory commissions greater public representation, the number of public members on the Commission was expanded from three to seven. This was accomplished by reducing the higher education membership from four to two, and teachers from five to three. In 1979, the Commission initiated legislation that expanded the Commission to 17 voting members, increased the higher education representation to three, and added a category for school service personnel other than administrators. The ex officio member for community colleges was eliminated. The composition of the Commission for the years 1971 through 1979 is shown in the table below (6: March, 1978; December, 1978).

Table 3

Composition of the Commission on Teacher Preparation & Licensing (CTPL)

Voting Members	1971 -77	1978	1979	Nonvoting Ex Officio Members	1971 -77	1978	1979
Classroom Teachers	5	3	3	State Superintendent	1	1	1
School Administrators	1	1	1	UC Regent	1	1	1
Other School Service Personnel	0	0	1	CSU Trustees	1	1	1

School Board Members	2	2	2	Private Colleges	0	1	1
College Faculty Members	4	2	3	Postsecondary Commission (CPEC)	1	1	1
Public Representatives	3	7	7	Community Colleges	1	1	0
TOTAL	15	15	17	TOTAL	5	5	5

Dr. Ken Lane was one of the more frequent Commission observers throughout the 1970s. His perceptions of the early years of the Commission follow:

The early years of the Commission were plagued by intense political and ideological in-fighting, primarily resulting from the Reagan administration's dual basis for making appointments. Some appointments were based upon previous volunteer service . . .

Until about 1973, the Commission was dominated by the bloc of members who were openly hostile to the teacher educators and teacher representatives who made up most of the public audience at its monthly meetings . . .

Information and suggestions from educators in the audience were not welcome at Commission meetings, except for a limited number of required public hearings. In committee meetings, matters under discussion often dealt directly with schools of education, yet some Commissioners doggedly refused to recognize the very people who could provide the data they sought (14: pp. 297-298).

The perceptions of the only two Commissioners to serve throughout the 1970s, Marcella Johnson and Stan Green, are somewhat different from those of Dr. Lane.

The distrust between both groups was most apparent. Many political appointees seemed to be on a power trip. Because of this, other members had to be continually alert so that teachers would be prepared . . . as provided for in the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1979.

We needed the field and its imprint. Soon, we had the cooperation and participation of the audience. The Commission soon found that we both needed each other (Marcella Johnson Interview, April, 1974).

A block which included ultra-conservative political appointees sought, from the beginning, to control the Commission and its committees. The other Commissioners—conservatives, moderates, and liberals combined—had to devote considerable time and energy to blocking these attempted takeovers. Both factions included professional educators and, though some such feelings did exist, I consider it incorrect to label either side as “anti-professional educator.”

From the outset, relations between the Commission and the audience at meetings were poor, evidencing lack of trust on both sides. The audiences were predominately members of the California Council on Teacher Education whose opposition to the Ryan Act and to the existence of the Commission was well known to Commissioners. It was, therefore, understandable that suggestions from the audience, although freely permitted, were received with skepticism and suspicion (Stan Green Interview, April, 1974).

In mid-1973, John Kelly and Stan Green rallied a group of Commissioners to win the chairmanship for Marcella Johnson. The Commission had gone through some growing pains and discord, and needed a person such as Marcella Johnson to bring the members together for a united effort. Her genuineness and soft-spoken manner, coupled with the fact that she was an experienced public school educator, enabled her to help build trust among the Commissioners, staff, and constituents.

In 1973, Dr. Sid Inglis did a survey of college faculty regarding the Ryan Act. Inglis reported the response to one of the questions in the following quote.

A number of respondents felt that the success of the Ryan Act would depend upon the Commission itself. Some felt that this was conditional on the Commission's ability to avoid purely political considerations and to act collaboratively upon institutional proposals with flexibility and foresight . . . without being co-opted by them (10: p. 9).

The Commissioners sought to make wise decisions in their selection of chairpersons, and seemed successful: Mr. Art Meyers, an elementary school teacher, chaired the Commission from July, 1975, through June 1977; Dr. Francisco Jimenez, a college teacher, chaired the Commission from July, 1977, through June, 1979; and Mr. Robert Salley, a secondary school teacher, chaired the Commission from July, 1979, on into the 1980s.

The table in the Appendix lists the voting members of the Commission and the Ex Officio members from the first meeting in 1971 through 1979.

Top Commission Senior Staff Members

Dr. George Gustafson, the Commission's first Executive Secretary. Several doctoral dissertations have described Dr. Gustafson as having a "confrontational personality." Teacher educators did not find him easy to work with, largely because of his adamant insistence on prescriptive guidelines for programs of professional preparation. It was, however, in large part his desire to "identify objective, independently verifiable standards of measurement and evaluation of teaching competence" that led to the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES). The National Institute of Education, the funding agency for the BTES, must have thought highly of him because they hired him when he left the Commission in August, 1973.

Dr. Peter LoPresti, Executive Secretary from December, 1973, through the 1970s. He issued monthly Executive Secretary Reports, which were clear and complete. He had excellent human relations skills, and he used these skills to build bridges and trust with the Commission's constituents.

As a nine-year-old immigrant who came to New Haven, Connecticut speaking no English, he had a special contribution to make to the Commission's major efforts in preparing bilingual/crosscultural teachers. As the administrative head of the agency, he was sometimes described as "a very humane and kindly benevolent dictator." He was a tough administrator in that he expected the best of every employee. However, the toughness was balanced with a firm pat on the back or a sincere "thank you," recalls Dick Mastain in 1995.

Dr. Blair Hurd, Assistant Bureau Chief, Department of Education, prior to joining the Commission; Commission Consultant, 1971 through 1973; Chief of Programs, 1974-1976; Director of Programs & Licensing, 1976 until his death on March 19, 1979. Blair Hurd was well liked and respected by the entire staff and by educators throughout California because of his knowledge, his spirit of service, his good humor, and his integrity. Chairperson Francisco Jimenez eloquently expressed what everyone thought of Blair when he reflected on Blair's life at the June, 1979 Commission meeting:

Blair Hurd was a truly spiritual man, and his spirituality was profoundly ethical. It was expressed in his boundless compassion for his fellows, in his high sense of the worth of each human being, and in his deep commitment to ideals of justice.

Because Blair Hurd's orientation in life was profoundly spiritual, he possessed an inner strength upon which he drew to actively study and analyze the impressions that came from without. He was not blown about by every wind of fashion or propaganda, but was accustomed to weighing and savoring each experience in the light of distinctive personal standards which he did not compromise for political reasons or personal gain.

It is this inner spiritual strength, combined with a brilliant mind, that explains why Blair Hurd was able to produce such vast amounts of work of such high quality. It explains why his work was never poorly done; why he never went astray, wasted his talents, or showed any symptoms of frustration.

Commission Observers

Beginning in the early 1970s there were a number of individuals who attended each of the monthly Commission meetings to observe, to offer suggestions, and to report back to their respective constituents. In time they became known as members of COCO (Committee of Commission Observers). Those who attended Commission meetings most frequently included the following:

Dr. James Cusick	California Council on the Education of Teachers
Mr. O. "Bud" Dickason	Los Angeles Unified School District
Dr. Jane Hebler	California Council of University Faculty Members
Dr. Sidney Inglis	California State University, Sacramento (1972-74)
Mr. Fred Joyce	Association of California School Administrators
Dr. Kenneth Lane	California Federation of Teachers
Dr. Joe Schieffer	California State University, Northridge
Dr. Curt Stafford	San Jose State University
Dr. J. Alden Vanderpool	California Teachers Association

The observers were an important part of the Commission's decision-making process, as evidenced by Commissioner Jack Evans' farewell letter to the Commission.

Please say my goodbyes to the audience who so loyally attended each of the monthly meetings, and thank them for me for the challenges, the questions, the concerns, the support, and the counsel they provided; and, yes even for the aggravation they caused us at times. For without all of this taking place, the commission would soon forget what the real world is like (6: November, 1978).

In his 1979 dissertation, Ken Lane wrote the following:

The Ryan Commission has nevertheless given California an open forum where these same teacher educators can freely express their views and influence policy. Not only can teacher educators express their opinions before the Ryan Commission, they often do so vehemently and at great length. The citizens serving on the Commission have gradually become more receptive and thoughtful than was the case in 1971, when Governor Reagan made the first appointments. Today, few educators complain that their voices are not heard and considered by the Ryan Commission (14: pp. 325-326).

SPECIAL CHALLENGES

In addition to the major tasks of the Commission during the 1970s, there were other “special challenges.” Some of those special challenges were crucial to the Mission of the Commission, some were just continually bothersome, while others were of a nature to threaten the very existence of the Commission. A summary of some of the special challenges follows.

Relationship with the State Board of Education

The Commission sent approximately 60 sets of Title 5 Regulations to the State Board during the 1970s, and on only a few occasions were the regulations “stayed,” with a request for additional information. Presentations were made to the State Board by the Commission chairperson and the Executive Secretary three or four times a year. The State Board representative to the Commission, Mr. George Hogan, was an effective go-between for both agencies—he kept open the lines of communication. In 1974, and 1975, the State Board discussed the feasibility of bringing the Commission's activities back under the State Board. In 1974, the discussion resulted in an article being written by Len Kreidt of the CTA, titled “State Department Wants

Credentialing Unit Back.” The CTA article opposed the move and supported the Commission. In 1975, the State Department of Education staff recommended that the time was not appropriate. The chairpersons of the Commission and Peter LoPresti worked very hard to maintain good relationships with the State Board and with the Superintendent. Wilson Riles worked well with the Commission, irrespective of his comments in April, 1971. The staff of the two agencies worked very well together on tasks of mutual interest, such as bilingual education and special education. In summary, what started as a confrontation between the two agencies became a very good working relationship by the end of the 1970s.

School District Involvement

The Ryan Act made provisions for a great deal of involvement in teacher preparation and licensing activities. The inclusion of six public school educators on the Commission was an indication of the Ryan Act’s intent to have public school personnel involved with Commission activities. The statutes called for public school educators to be involved in developing standards for subject matter programs and programs of professional preparation; to serve as members of visiting teams to evaluate programs; and to participate in internship programs. The Commission, by regulation, authorized school districts (and IHEs and county offices) to serve as Commission-approved Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for the purpose of evaluating candidates for the Designated Subjects’ Vocational, Trade, and Technical Credential. The LEAs were also authorized to provide the in-service needed for renewing the credential. The Commission, by statute and regulation, also authorized LEAs to do the language and cultural assessment for the bilingual Certificate of Competence. The Commission authorized school districts to verify experience in lieu of six of the 24 semester-unit requirements, as per legislation of 1975, authorizing the issuance of specialist credentials on direct application. In many other ways, school districts were becoming more and more involved with the preparation of teachers, with assessment for purposes of certification, and with verification of experience in lieu of transcript credit. The statutes provide for on-site visits to colleges and to school districts, and, in fact, many of the LEAs were monitored or went through External Assessment. Effective

collaboration between school districts and colleges and will continue to be a challenge in the 1980s.

The Preparation of Vocational, Trade, and Technical Teachers: Designated Subjects Credentials

Prior to the Ryan Act, applicants for a credential to teach vocational, trade, or technical education courses went to UC, Los Angeles or UC, Berkeley for evaluation and in-service education. The Ryan Act and Commission regulations made provision for a Local Education Agency to be approved by the Commission to evaluate the work experience and the education and/or training of the applicants, and, if qualified, to recommend for the Preliminary Designated Subjects Credential. The LEA, in order to be approved by the Commission, was required to offer a program of personalized in-service for the “Clear” Credential. Maintaining the quality of each of the eighteen Commission-approved LEAs for the Designated Subjects Credential was a special challenge of the 1970s.

The Preparation of Bilingual Teachers

The Ryan Act did not establish a credential authorizing the instruction of limited or non-English speaking students. However, the Commission was authorized to adopt a bilingual authorization within the provisions of the Specialist Instruction Teaching Credential. In 1972, the Dean of the School of Education at CSU, Sacramento, Dr. Tom Carter, recommended to the Commission the development of standards for a Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist Instruction Credential. The Commission sent letters to a wide audience asking: “Is there a need for a bilingual credential?” Based on responses, the Commission approved the adoption of the Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist Credential; selected an advisory panel to develop guidelines; and adopted the guidelines and sent them to the field for review in December, 1972. In May, 1973, the guidelines were adopted following a public hearing, and California became the first state in the nation to adopt guidelines for a bilingual credential.

In 1973, the Bilingual/Crosscultural Teacher Training Act was passed. The bill allocated \$20,000 to the Commission and required the Commission to develop a career ladder and to get at least five colleges involved in preparing bilingual teachers. Manuals for the development of bilingual programs were developed and sent to the colleges. By June, 1975, 13 colleges had Commission-approved bilingual/crosscultural programs.

The need for bilingual teachers in late 1975 was estimated to range from 9 to 12,000. In 1976, the Commission established a Bilingual Emphasis Authorization that could be added to a basic teaching credential, and adopted Title 5 Regulations for an Emergency Bilingual Teaching Authorization. Also, in 1976, legislation was passed which mandated the employment of certified bilingual teachers as of September, 1977, and the legislation authorized the Commission to issue a Bilingual Certificate of Competence. The acquisition of the Bilingual Certificate of Competence was to be based on an assessment as opposed to transcript credit. The Commission approved the 24 IHEs with approved bilingual programs to conduct assessments for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence. In addition, the Commission approved specific Local Education Agencies to assess for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence.

Bilingual supply and demand information was reported to the Commission at the October, 1978 meeting. The Commissioners were told “that the current production of bilingual teachers in California is meeting only 40% of the need, and that we can expect to move up to meeting only 60% of the need next year” (6: October, 1978).

During 1978-79, the Commission sought to address the state’s continuing need for bilingual teachers. This resulted in an increase in the number of institutions of higher education with Commission-approved bilingual teacher preparation programs from 33 to 36, and an increase in the number of assessor agencies approved to recommend candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence from 19 to 31. The Commission also conducted on-site monitoring visits to all assessor agencies approved to recommend candidates for the Certificate of Competence.

The Commission extended great efforts to provide qualified bilingual teachers for California’s classrooms. Legislation by Moscone, Chacon, and others contributed to the supply effort.

However, the gap between supply and demand grew rapidly each year, irrespective of exhaustive efforts. It remained a special and unfulfilled Commission challenge at the close of the 1970s.

The Eminence Credential

The Eminence Credential was included in the Ryan Act as a compromise to the request of the Governor's Commission on Educational Reform to have a single teaching credential and no credential requirement for non-teaching assignment. In response to a question about the uses of the Eminence Credential, Commissioner Conner replied:

Maybe so . . . This is a place . . . where school boards and their administrators can do a better job than any state agency. We can hardly require that every candidate be specially prepared to teach minority group children, but a district can give hiring preference to someone who has prepared himself specially. This may be one of the uses of the "Eminence Credential" (1: pp).

While the Commissioners seemed pleased at first to have the option provided by the Eminence Credential, they soon became disenchanted. Time and again the chairperson assigned a committee of Commissioners or staff to review the procedures and criteria for issuing the Eminence Credential without ever achieving complete satisfaction. The Eminence Credential remained a special challenge for the 1980s.

The Children's Center Permit

The special challenge in this case was how to resolve a conflict between a social concept and an educational concept. State Senator Gary Hart and other legislators wanted to expand the opportunities for more children to attend preschool programs. In order to staff the increased number of preschool programs, it was necessary to also increase the number of available holders of the Children's Center Permit. The Emergency Children's Center Permit required 60 semester-

hours of coursework, including the 12 semester-hours in subjects related to early childhood education; or 30 semester-hours of coursework, including the 12 semester-hours in early childhood education, and one year of successful experience as a teacher or a non-teaching aide. The regular Children's Center Permit required a Baccalaureate Degree. Senator Hart thought the requirements for the Children's Center Permit were excessive. He learned of the Child Development Associate (CDA) sponsored by the Early Childhood Division of the United States Department of Education.

Senator Hart liked the idea that the Child Development Associate Permit (CDA) was to be recommended on the basis of a performance evaluation of the candidate. The Commission's position was that the standards for the CDA were far below the existing standards for the Children's Center Permit. It was also expressed that while the CDA would be an upgrade of standards in some states, it would be the opposite in California.

The Commission held a number of conferences with preschool teachers and other early childhood experts to try to resolve the conflict between the standards for the Children's Center Permit and the CDA. The Commission, on the recommendation of participants in the conferences and work sessions, proposed Title 5 Regulations that were not acceptable to Senator Hart and other legislators who felt that the Commission had disregarded the following budget language:

*By November 15, 1977, the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing
(a) recognize the Child Development Associate as adequate preparation for a
Children's Center Instructional Permit . . . (6: June, 1977).*

Finally, compromises were reached and the Title 5 Regulations were adopted in October, 1978. Commissioner Nancy Lowensohn abstained from voting on the Title 5 Regulations, and made an eloquent statement regarding her reasons. Excerpts from her statement are included below:

*The discussion of CDA and children's center licensing has brought forth many
other entanglements. These entanglements, often extraneous to the issue,*

threaten the very existence of this Commission. CTPL's seeming disregard for the budget language of last year infuriated key legislators . . .

As a classroom teacher, I think the survival of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing is of over-riding importance to the profession. I do not want it made impotent through lack of funds. If the survival of the Commission is predicated upon compromise, however distasteful, we must seek compromises. This vote compromises me, and I must abstain . . . (6: October, 1978).

The issue of the Children's Center Permit was, indeed, a special challenge. Senator Hart unquestionably wanted to promote a very worthwhile *social* objective—more children's centers for more preschool children. The Commission wanted to maintain standards for those who teach in children's centers--a worthwhile *educational* objective.

SUMMARY

Many of the Commission meetings began with a minute of silence to reflect on the tasks ahead, followed by a verse or thought appropriate to the work of the Commission. The selections usually focused on some aspect of schooling such as the following:

Children and young people are our greatest treasure. When we speak of them we speak of the future of the world. Together, with the people of all lands, we must work to protect the common treasure. And more than that, we must nurture that richness. to me, the life of a single child is worth more than all of my music (Pablo Casals).

At the January, 1979 Commission meeting, Executive Secretary LoPresti recounted the intense efforts made and accomplishments achieved in fully implementing the Ryan Act. He then proceeded to talk about the goals for the 1980s. These goals were based on three planning seminars the Commission had held in 1978, and on all of the discussions, reports, research

efforts, and agendas that occurred from March, 1971, to January, 1979. Each goal he proposed should be read with the question in mind: “What happened to that goal in the 1980s?”

Goals for the 1980s and Beyond	
1.	Develop procedures for the evaluation of credential recipients;
2.	Secure legislation that authorizes the Commission to monitor and ensure the appropriate and legal assignment of credentialed personnel;
3.	Analyze the entire program approval process, including the guidelines for program development, the paper-review, and the on-site evaluation;
4.	Refine the necessary balance between the College Recommend process and the Direct Application process;
5.	Determine the impact of eliminating the life credential, and requiring in-service education as a basis for the renewal of a credential;
6.	Conduct research as the basis for determining policy and setting standards for subject matter waiver programs and programs of professional preparation. (The BTES highlighted the unique contribution that a state agency can make in contract research.);
7.	Continue to recognize the crucial and sensitive work of the Committee of Credentials; and provide support, oversight, and revised statutes, regulations, and procedures commensurate with the difficulty of the Committee's work;
8.	Conduct research to determine the reasons for the lack of exploratory programs, and on the basis of that research, make the necessary revisions in regulations and procedures, and seek legislation, if necessary, to encourage the diversity specified in the Ryan Act preamble;
9.	Develop an exemplary examination system to verify subject matter knowledge that has the support of the public school educators, college faculty, and the community of test experts;
10	Analyze and update the Ryan Act, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limit on professional education credits in teaching credential programs; • The stipulation that credential programs must be available within the degree program at public institutions; • The existing gap between preservice and inservice teacher education; and • The existing statutory partitioning of subject matter learned as a college student, and the organization and application (pedagogy) of that subject matter necessary as a classroom teacher;
11	Become the recognized leader in providing the climate, statutes, regulations, and motivation for the most creative and effective teacher preparation programs in the nation.

Table
CTPL Members 1971 through 1979

Name	Categories	Date of 1st Meeting	Date of Last Meeting	Name	Categories	Date of 1st Meeting	Date of Last Meeting
Barbara Anderson	SST	3/71	12/71	Robert Salley	SST	3/76	--
Mary Ann Stewart	SST	3/71	3/78	Nancy Lowensohn	EST	3/76	--
Art Meyers	EST	3/71	7/77	Francisco Jimenez	CF	3/76	--
Elaine Pfeifer	EST	3/71	12/71	Carolyn Denham	CF	3/76	--
Conrad Briner	CF	3/71	6/72	Marcella Johnson	PC	3/76	11/79
Jack Conner	CF	3/71	11/74	Raquel Muir	EST	6/76	--
Harry Walker	CF	3/71	12/73				
William Winnett	CF	3/71	12/71	John Eckhard	PC	9/77	--
Virginia Braun	PC	3/71	12/73				
Eunice (Mike) Evans	PC	3/71	12/74	David Levering	CF	1/78	--
J. Stanley Green	PC	3/71	11/79	Thomas Stang	SST	1/78	--
Marcella Johnson	SA	3/71	1/76	Avril Mae Allan	EST	4/78	--
John Cimolino	SBM	3/71	12/76	Oscar O. Canedo	SBM	4/78	--
Kathleen Crow	SBM	3/71	7/73	Seymour M. Rose	SBM	4/78	8/79
Mary B. Liu	SST	12/71	2/76	Dominadora Antony	PPS	8/79	8/79
Paulette Johnson	EST	12/71	7/74	E. J. Oshins	PC	12/79	--
Daniel Martinez	CF	12/71	2/76	Margarita Gamiz	PC	12/79	--
Robert Kelley	CF	4/73	6/74	Michael Shapiro	PC	8/79	--
John L. Evans	SA	2/74	11/78				
Dorothy Gibson	SBM	2/74	3/77				
Vance Lewis	PC	2/74	12/75				
H. Homer Aschmann	CF	8/74	9/75				
Curt Stafford	CF	12/74	12/75				
Robert Renz	PC	12/74	12/75				
Sam Itaya	EST	12/74	12/75				
Ugo P. Lea	CF	12/74	11/76				

<u>Abbreviation Code of Categories</u>	
Secondary School Teacher	SST
Elementary School Teacher	EST
College Faculty	CF
School Administrator	SA
School Board Member	SBM
Pupil Personnel Services	PPS

CTPL Ex Officio Members 1971 through 1979

Name	Categories	Date of 1st Meeting	Date of Last Meeting	Name	Categories	Date of 1st Meeting	Date of Last Meeting
Horace Crandell	XCFHE	3/71	3/72	Elias Wiebe	XPC	7/78	--
Robert Smith	XCC	3/71	11/76	Harvey Hunt	XSPI	8/78	--
Staten Webster	XUC	3/71	8/74	R. E. Smith	XCC	11/78	--
John Baird	XCSU	3/71	2/72				
				John Nelson	SCSU	8/79	--
Arthur Polster	XCFHE	4/72	10/72				
George Hogan	XSPI	2/72	7/78				
Leo Cain	XCSU	3/72	4/77				
E. P. O'Reilly	SCFHE	11/72	3/76				
Gary Fenstermacher	XUC	12/74	9/77				
Harold Wilson	SCFHE	5/76	--				
	SCPEC						
John Greenlee	XCSU	5/77	6/79				
Irv Hendrick	XUC	11/77	--				
Sanford L. Huddy	XCC	1/77	1/78				

<u>Abbreviation Codes of Categories</u>	
Council for Higher Education	XCFHE
later California Post Secondary Commission	XCPEC
Community Colleges	XCC
California State University Trustees	XCSU
Superintendent of Public Instruction	XSPI
Private Colleges	XPC
University of California	XUC